

The Westminster Review

Vol. 130

1859


Librarian

Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library
Govt. of West Bengal



LOCAL GOVERNMENT: THE FRANCHISE QUESTION.

THE Liberal party have been so busily engaged in fighting Mr. Ritchie's obnoxious Compensation Clauses, that they have bestowed little or no consideration on the Local Government Electors Bill, on which the Ministerial scheme of local government reform is based. The foundations have been "passed," the proposed superstructure alone is condemned. Yet this Bill, which has already been sent up to the House of Lords, falls far short of the ideal of a good Liberal; and unless, contrary to all precedent, their Lordships introduce into it large and sweeping amendments of a reforming character, it will leave a considerable proportion of the adult population without voice or vote in the management of their own local affairs.

The Government have considered that the necessities of the case will be met by extending the municipal franchise to the new local government districts which they propose to create. That the municipal franchise is a narrow and restricted one weighs as nothing in their minds: the fact that it is enjoyed by 240 municipal boroughs seems to them a full and sufficient reason for its adoption as the basis of local government throughout the country. These municipal boroughs, however, represent only a fraction of the population, while the new Ministerial measure will affect considerably over three-fourths of the inhabitants of England and Wales. The introduction of a measure so far-reaching as this afforded a fit and proper opportunity for a full examination of the anomalies and restrictions of the municipal franchise, with a view to their removal or amendment. But the Government have thought otherwise; and the consequence is either that this important question will be shelved for an indefinite period, or that, if the Liberals do their duty, it will occupy the time and attention of the House of Commons for session after session until full justice in this matter has been done.

For some weeks after the introduction of Mr. Ritchie's Bills it was the fashion to speak of them as democratic. They are nothing of the kind. They will effect only this: that local affairs will be administered by the representatives of *some* of the ratepayers. But the great bulk of the adult inhabitants will remain, as now, wholly unrepresented. In these circumstances there will not be much

cause for regret if it should prove, as is suspected in some quarters, that the Government have ^{no} ~~no~~ intention of carrying their Bills this session.

The attempts made to amend the Electors Bill in committee showed that the Liberal leaders are fully alive to many of its defects. But their efforts were futile. Mr. Stansfeld vainly endeavoured to carry an amendment to assimilate the qualification of electors of guardians of the poor (including the abolition of the plural vote) to the conditions prescribed in the Bill with regard to electors of the county authorities. The amendment was a perfectly reasonable one, and necessary, if merely for the sake of consistency; for, if the Bill become law, boards of guardians will be the only local authority elected under the plural system of voting. Moreover, a sound argument has yet to be found in favour of bestowing six votes on the occupier of property of the annual value of £250, while restricting the less fortunate occupier of property worth less than £50 a year to one vote only. Nevertheless, the Government, with the aid of their obedient followers, succeeded in defeating the amendment.

Professor Stuart made a gallant but unsuccessful effort to secure the enfranchisement of London lodgers, and a similar amendment, which met with a similar fate, was moved by Mr. Hobhouse with regard to country districts. In support of all these amendments it was pointed out how desirable it is to have only one register for all electoral purposes. As women and peers who are legally qualified are entitled to vote at local but not at Parliamentary elections, it was suggested that their names should be included in separate lists.

It is not alone on the ground of economy that the proposal for one register is to be recommended. Regard must also be had for the bewildered claimant for a vote. The conditions on which a vote at the election of a vestry or a board of guardians is granted have little in common with those on which the present municipal and new local government franchise is based, while these in their turn differ widely from the conditions on which the right to vote in the election of a member of Parliament depends.

In all democratic countries the plain duty of the Legislature is to bring the franchise within the easiest possible reach of duly qualified citizens. In the United Kingdom, on the other hand, the franchise is "cabined, cribbed, confined," and hedged round with restrictions. How annoying these restrictions are, and how difficult it is for a man not possessed of an expert's knowledge on the subject to know whether and why he is or is not entitled to a vote, and how, if unenfranchised, he may become qualified, will be gathered from the following specification of the chief conditions on which the Parliamentary, municipal, and other local franchises are granted.

It should be noted that in every case—except that of lodgers—

the franchise depends upon the payment of all poor-rates payable six months before the termination of the qualifying period.

1. VESTRY ELECTIONS—

Qualifying period. One year up to the date of election.

Persons qualified. Male and female resident ratepayers.

Register. The rate-book.

System of voting. As many votes as there are vacancies.

Only one vote to be given for any candidate.

2. ELECTION OF GUARDIANS OF THE POOR—

Qualifying period. Same as above.

Persons qualified. Male and female ratepayers and owners.

Register. The rate-book.

System of voting. One vote for each vacancy on a rental of less than £50; two votes between £50 and £100; three between £100 and £150; four between £150 and £200; five between £200 and £250; and six for £250 and over.

3. SCHOOL BOARDS—

Qualifying period, persons qualified, and register. Same as in case of vestries.

System of voting. Cumulative, one vote for each vacancy.

4. MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—

(This is the system which, with slight modifications, Mr. Ritchie proposes to adopt with regard to the new County Councils.)

Qualifying period. One year up to July 15 in the year in which the register is made up.

Persons qualified. Male or female ratepayers residing in constituency or within seven miles of it. Occupiers of premises claiming to be rated and tendering rates due. *Occupiers of land of the annual value of £10 or upwards.

Register. Special.

System of voting. Same as in vestry elections.

Register comes into force in November.

5. PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—

Qualifying period. Same as in municipal boroughs for householders, occupiers of land or premises of clear annual value of £10 and lodgers, and leaseholders in counties.

Freeholders and copyholders in counties must have had possession for six months up to July 15.

Persons qualified.

(a) In counties—

Forty shilling freeholders.

Copyholders of estate of £5 annual value.

* An amendment to the Local Government Electors Bill enfranchising such occupiers was carried in the House of Commons, and is not likely to be defeated in the House of Lords.

Occupiers of land and tenements at rental of not less than £50..

Leaseholders of sixty years' lease where annual value is £5,
or of twenty years' lease where annual value is £50.

(b) In counteis and boroughs—

Householders.

Lodgers where annual value of the lodgings unfurnished
is £10.

Occupiers of land and premises valued at £10 a year.

Occupiers of dwelling-house by virtue of service or employ-
ment.

Register. Special. Comes into force on January 1.

System of voting. One vote for each vacancy.

The receipt of parochial relief other than medical or surgical assistance is a disqualification in all the above cases. Medical relief disqualifies the recipient only from voting in the election of poor-law guardians.

Women are denied the Parliamentary franchise, but in respect of all the other governing bodies enumerated above have full and equal civil rights with the sterner sex.

It will be seen at once that, so far as men are concerned, the Parliamentary franchise is wider than all others. But it is subject to so many limitations, that at every general election a very large proportion of the manhood of these islands find themselves without the right to exercise the suffrage. The number of male adults in the United Kingdom is estimated to exceed seven millions, and the excess will not be exhausted if we include in it the inmates of our gaols and lunatic asylums. The number of persons on the Parliamentary register is returned at 5,800,000. This return, however, merely gives the number of votes which may be polled, not of voters who may poll them. Professor Thorold Rogers recently owned to having a vote in eight different constituencies, and there are doubtless many great landowners who are entitled to even more votes than these. Occupiers of both town and country houses, owners of land in more than one constituency, every man who occupies an office or place of business not in the same constituency as his house, provided that the two constituencies are not more than seven miles apart and the premises occupied in the former are of the annual value of £10, non-resident freeholders, and those other non-residents qualified to vote as leaseholders in counties, those who enjoy the livery or university franchise—all these have in all probability at least two votes each, and in many cases more. Large deductions then have to be made from the return before we arrive at the number of electors. Five millions is probably an exaggerated estimate.

But there is another consideration. The register does not come into force until six months after the expiration of the qualifying period. Some of the electors will then be dead, many will have

moved so far away as to be unable to record their votes in the event of an election. These latter are, therefore, for all practical purposes disfranchised; and they form a considerable percentage of the electorate—a percentage which will steadily increase as the life of the register runs out. The sufferers, of course, belong chiefly to the poorer classes, the search for employment necessitating frequent change of residence.

It is on the poor that the Liberal party mainly rely for support, and their chances of success, therefore, largely depend on whether a general election takes place early or late in the year. They may truly say, with Bussy d'Amboise—

“Fortune, not reason, rules the state of things.”

But, putting party considerations on one side, there can be no reasonable defence offered for a system which operates with such severity against one—and that the largest—class of voters.

The proposal, therefore, for one register—involving as it does the assimilation of the municipal to the Parliamentary franchise—is, although excellent as far as it goes, open to the serious objection that it does not go nearly far enough. Before suggesting, however, any further reform, it will be well to deal with the objections which even this moderate proposal evoked from Conservative scribes and speakers.

The duties of a town councillor are scarcely as important as those of a member of Parliament; and it requires less intelligence and knowledge accurately to appreciate the issues raised at a municipal than at a Parliamentary election. A citizen, then, who is found worthy to exercise the Parliamentary franchise might surely without grave danger to the State be permitted to take part in the election of a vestryman or municipal councillor. To this it is replied that the functions of local bodies are administrative, not legislative; that vestrymen and councillors who do their duty have to occupy themselves merely in a judicious and economical expenditure of the rates, and that therefore the only persons entitled to the local franchise are the ratepayers.

But who are the ratepayers? Every one who pays rent pays rates. The overseers may receive the rates from his superior landlord, but in the rent of the rent-payer his proportion of the rates is included. The reduction of the rates to *nil* or their increase by 100 per cent. would bring about a corresponding reduction or increase in the rent of lodgings in the neighbourhood. Lodgers, therefore, are ratepayers. So, too, all who receive lodging as part payment for services rendered must be regarded as contributing to the rates. There seems to be a curious impression in the minds of many Conservative members that the nominal ratepayer, whether he or others actually pay the rates, is the only person entitled to a vote. For Mr. Stanley Leighton gravely proposed in the House of Commons to

amend the Electors Bill so that the electors of the new county councils shall consist only of those who pay rates directly to the overseers. In support of his amendment, it was mentioned that in Willesden there were 640 owners of property who paid the rates made in respect of it, but who would not be enfranchised under this Bill, while their 1800 tenants, who did not pay the rates, would have their names placed on the register. The fact that these tenants find the rates included in the rent apparently goes for nothing. The mere receipt of rent is a qualification for a vote, according to the gospel of Mr. Leighton and his Tory colleagues who supported him.

In this connection it is important to remember that owners of cheap house property are in the habit of paying the rates themselves, as, in consideration of the cost of collection being saved and in view of the possibility of the houses being unoccupied during the period for which the rates are made, the overseers make them a large abatement off the amount of the rates. Perhaps the owners give the tenants the benefit of this discount. Perhaps! Whether they do or not, their claim to the franchise is small indeed as compared with that of the tenants. If it be admitted that representation should accompany taxation, then all who either directly or indirectly are subjects of taxation should be enfranchised, and the justice of the tenants' claim in these cases is established. If, on the other hand, there should be no representation without taxation, then, in the absence of other qualifications, the owners would have no right to be represented.

When Lord Sherbrooke was plain Mr. Lowe, he and Mr. Goschen were accustomed with tedious iteration to protest against any extension of the suffrage on the ground that grave national danger was to be apprehended from the enfranchisement of the poor and illiterate. Their ignorance, we were told, would make them a prey to unscrupulous agitators, and their poverty would tempt them to give effect at the polling booths to their bitter prejudices against the propertied classes. It was forgotten that the poor have no monopoly of ignorance, and that the rich have for generations utilized their voting power in their own interests to the detriment of the masses of their fellow-countrymen.

But such objections are no longer worth a moment's consideration. The Legislature has decided that neither poverty nor ignorance has power to disqualify, but that length of residence shall be the only test of a householder's fitness for the franchise. And as it can hardly be contended that in this respect there shall be one law for the householder and another for the lodger, those who dispute the latter's claim to representation in town or county councils must find some other ground of objection.

We proceed now to consider how far the extension of the benefits of the Parliamentary Reform Acts to Local Government districts

would fail to satisfy the just and reasonable demands of the people for the suffrage.

First, as to lodgers. Householders may move from house to house in the same constituency without forfeiting their right to be enrolled on the Parliamentary register. But a lodger may not; he must remain during the qualifying period in lodgings in the same house or lose his vote. If he change his lodgings or move therefrom to become a householder, he does so under pain of a year's disfranchisement. A more ridiculously unjust penalty it is impossible to imagine.

Then, again, the value of the householder's premises is not taken into consideration when dealing with his claim to a vote. But a lodger must occupy lodgings of the annual value of £10, or remain disenfranchised. In suburban and country districts this senseless and annoying restriction keeps many a good and capable citizen off the register. It often happens that a workman who is employed in a great industrial centre, where he would have to pay 5s. a week for a room, finds that he can get a lodging in the suburbs at 3s. or 3s. 6d. a week, and by taking a workman's ticket still keep his rent and railway fare below 5s. weekly, and he determines to exchange during his leisure hours the smoke-laden atmosphere of the city for the pure and wholesome air of the suburb. No doubt he is a wise and sensible fellow, but the hardship of it is that by benefiting his health he forfeits his rights of citizenship.

But the anomalies of the lodger franchise do not end here. The overseers are bound under penalty (which, however, is very rarely enforced) to place every duly qualified householder on the register. But the lodger has every year to make out his claim on a form which is very probably a perfectly insoluble puzzle to him.

"As there is no firm reason to be rendered" why any distinction should be made between a householder and lodger, it is greatly to be desired that they should at once be placed on an equal footing for the purposes of the franchise. An addition—which could only be described as enormous—would then be made to the electoral roll.

The wrongs of the householder next claim attention. A paternal Legislature has in its wisdom sought to check any roving disposition on the part of Englishmen by making the loss of civil rights the penalty for a change of residence from one constituency to another. The municipal franchise can be exercised only by those who from July to July continue as occupiers in the same borough. As the register comes into force in November, a householder has to live for at least sixteen months, and often over two years, in the same borough before he is entitled to a vote. During all this time he is a subject of taxation, compelled to pay his quota of the local rates, and however greatly he may object to the manner in which the local funds to which he must contribute are administered, he cannot make an

effectual protest against it by recording his vote at the polling-booth until his period of probation has expired. His only consolation is—if consolation it be—that he undergoes no exceptional hardship. Compare the rate-book with the register in any municipal borough, and it will be found that a considerable proportion of ratepayers are not enrolled as burgesses.

It is very difficult to suggest any explanation why change of residence should have a disfranchising effect, except that it was perhaps deemed desirable to save the overseers time and trouble in the preparation of the electoral roll. A man who takes a new house does not become *ipso facto* a worse citizen or less capable of exercising his civil rights. He does not escape from any civil obligation, or from his liability to pay rates and taxes. But he has crossed the boundary of a constituency; and for no greater offence than this hundreds of thousands of English men and women are to-day disfranchised. Yet Mr. Ritchie, who has resisted successfully every attempt to extend the narrow boundaries with which he has surrounded the local government franchise, is never tired of repeating the parrot-cry of "Trust in the people," which he has learned from the Tory democrats. To be exact, the Government should boast of their trust in half the people. But that trust cannot be extended to those who live in lodgings or move from one district to another. If the custom continue of describing our form of government as democratic, the need will soon become apparent for a new and limited definition of democracy.

The removal of the disabilities to which so many householders and lodgers are subject, would be effected by reducing the period of qualification to reasonable proportions. The principal objection urged to a material reduction is that it would afford facilities for the creation of faggot-votes, and for swamping the wishes and opinions of a constituency by the importation of a mass of new electors. The danger is not a very real one; and, such as it is, would be averted by making the creation of faggot-votes a misdemeanour punishable by imprisonment. The punishment should be rigorously enforced, not merely against the faggot-voter, but also against those who induced or paid him to make a bogus qualification for himself. This system of fraud has, however, been effectually checked in Parliamentary constituencies by the Reform Acts of 1884-5, and is hardly likely to be resorted to for the purposes of a county council election.

A further objection urged against the reduction of the qualifying period, is that new-comers might vote without having paid their rates. They would nevertheless be liable for them, and the local authorities might safely be relied on to enforce payment. Or if this objection should really weigh heavily with Parliament, a simple way of meeting it would be to enact that no ratepayer's vote can be taken until he has paid at least one quarter's rate.

With the view of depriving these objections of all force whatever, it might be well to fix the qualifying period at three months. The register could, as now, be revised once a year; but it should be the duty of the Registration Officer to issue once a quarter supplemental lists of electors, including the names of all who had become qualified for the franchise since the publication of the register.

A further important reform would be effected by relieving the overseers from any responsibility whatever for the preparation of the lists of voters, and by appointing a special salaried officer to discharge this important duty. The overseers are not paid, and they leave the preparation of the lists to the rate-collectors; and although it is customary in every Revision Court for the Revising Barrister to compliment the overseers on the admirable manner in which the lists have been prepared, there is much more courtesy than truth in the compliment. As a matter of fact, the work is very badly done. Rate-collectors are not, as a rule, registration experts, and their main business is to ascertain the names of the persons from whom they have to collect the rates and to collect them. Thus it happens every year that in each constituency there are nearly as many points of difference as of resemblance between the overseers' lists and the register.

A Registration Officer, then, should be appointed in each borough or county division in the kingdom. His duties would be to ascertain who are entitled to the franchise, and he should be subject to a heavy fine for omitting any duly qualified person from the list of voters; unless, of course, he could show that the omission was due to no laches on the part of himself or his subordinates.

Under such a system as this the boundaries of the franchise would be indefinitely increased, and, with rare exceptions, only those would be denied the vote who were subject to some legal incapacity. As to this class no plea can be put forward in support of the claim of lunatics and criminals to the suffrage, while the enfranchisement of peers for Parliamentary purposes must be preceded by the abolition of the House of Lords. There is, however, much to be said on behalf of the recipient of parochial relief.

In a long and severe winter many respectable artisans are driven to the parish for assistance. A long spell of enforced idleness, sickness at home, or other misfortune, may render aid absolutely necessary to keep the wolf from the door. The relief he receives from the parish may be only a few shillings in value—considerably less, indeed, than the current quarter's rates; but even if he pay these latter he will be disfranchised at the next revision, and will remain off the register for a whole year. The punishment is assuredly undeserved, and by many is felt most acutely.

Others there are who work their five days a week in the labour-yard of the workhouse, receiving on an average less than half the

current rate of wages. Here there is work done and inadequately paid for, and the parish, if any one, is the gainer by the transaction. Yet, so elastic is the meaning of the term "relief," in its parochial sense, that it includes even this ill-paid labour. The remedy is fortunately as apparent as the abuse. Work in the labour-yard should no longer be regarded as parochial relief.

And whether the receipt of parochial relief should in any case constitute a legal incapacity is at least open to argument. After every allowance has been made for results of drunkenness and vicious habits, it remains indisputable that in the majority of cases poverty is the fault, not so much of the victim, as of the system under which he struggles for subsistence. If, however, the period of disfranchisement were assimilated to the period of qualification, a large reduction would be made in the number of those who are disqualified on account of having accepted relief from the parish.

Any proposal for the establishment of adult suffrage is received with a thrill of horror by many of those who support the present system with its narrow limitations and illogical exceptions. Yet this is the goal to which we must advance, unless we are prepared to retrace our steps. We have crossed the border-line between oligarchy and democracy. We have done away with a property qualification for the franchise. We have laughed to scorn the proposal of applying the test of knowledge. We recognize the right of the poorest and most ignorant to a vote if he lives for one year in one place; we decline to recognize it in the richest or most learned if they leave the district in which they were residing. A more absurd test of fitness for the enjoyment of the rights of citizenship cannot be imagined. Regard for consistency, no less than love of justice, indicates to us the course we ought to pursue. We cannot go back. The genius of our Constitution is opposed to any retrogression. *Vestigia nulla retrorsum* has ever been our motto—and we must advance until our system of government has become democratic, not merely in name, but in form and reality.

NURSES AND NURSING.

THE subject of nurses and their work has lately been brought prominently before the public : (1) by the devotion of the Women's Jubilee offering to the maintenance of district nurses for the sick poor, (2) and by the splendid munificence of four of our city merchants, who have promised the sum of £20,000 towards starting a National Pension Fund for nurses and hospital officials. Since the period when Dickens portrayed Sairey Gamp, a radical change has taken place in the public estimation of nurses, and a sentimental glamour has been thrown over the services rendered to the sick ; but practical philosophy has done little to aid the labours which sentiment has admired, and few people have any definite idea of what a nurse's life consists, or how frequently she seeks in vain the help and sympathy she willingly gives to others. There are three chief branches of nursing—district, hospital, and private ; and it will be as well to consider each in turn, and see in what way the workers in each branch will benefit by the generosity of which they have just become recipients.

District nurses are supplied to the metropolis and most large towns by an admirable series of institutions, the expenses of which are generally defrayed by subscriptions collected in their neighbourhood. About half a dozen nurses usually live together under a lady superintendent, and at the request of doctors, ministers, or district visitors, they visit those in need of their services. About fifteen cases are attended every day by each nurse, but where there is severe illness two or three calls may have to be made on the same patient during the day, or the nurse may consider it necessary to stay all night by the side of the sufferer. The superintendent manages the housekeeping, and keeps a list of cases requiring visiting ; she usually receives a salary of from £50 to £70 per annum, while the nurses' pay ranges from £20 upwards. The nurses rise early and breakfast together ; then, having made their own beds, they don their cloaks and bonnets, and go their several ways. The homes which these women visit are sometimes those of the very poor, or those of labourers, artisans, or the lower middle-classes. In the first case the patient has probably some insuperable objection to a hospital, or is suffering from a complaint which precludes him from the public wards. Here the nurse helps in making the bed, such as it is, and

scas that the sick man starts the day as clean and comfortable as possible. Not unusually, where there is great poverty, and the patient has been bedridden for years, the nurse acts as almoner to some charitable lady, and leaves behind her a small gift of food or clothing. In the cottage of an artisan may be a small child, the victim of hip disease and abscesses. Here the appearance of the nurse is greeted with an eager smile; for she alone knows how to handle the small sufferer so as not to jar the injured limb, every movement of which gives exquisite agony. The child is dressed and carried down to the kitchen table, which, though hard, affords her a wider view of life and of such incidents as may help to speed the weary hours. Another patient is in a rather better station of life, yet cannot afford to add to the other expenses of illness the weekly guinea, which is the smallest fee ever accepted by a private nurse. The wife here is a helpless, nervous woman, who keeps her husband in a state of irritation, and the whole house in execrable confusion. In a few minutes the trained hand and educated sense of the nurse have reduced all to order without either noise or bustle: she lifts the man without discomfort either to herself or him, while the crumbs are removed from the bed; and the cold, sloppy poultice, which before her arrival was meandering about the pillow, is replaced by a firm, hot mass of meal, tightly, yet comfortably, banded in the proper position. After two or three visits here, the nurse manages to teach the wife a little calmness and order, and instructs her how to perform the few simple duties which are necessary. A large number of the visits made by district nurses are to women lately confined; and here their presence is especially valuable, both to mother and child. Cleanliness and regularity reign where a nurse has sway, and her common-sense dispels the many superstitions which actuate women to folly while in this state. It is the nurse who sternly sets her face against "sleepy stuff" and patent medicines and foods for the infant; who persuades the mother to date her recovery by the return of her strength, instead of fixed periods; who pulls the sack out of the chimney and pronounces night air not injurious, and who teaches that children thrive on light and air. One great disadvantage is that a district nurse seldom happens to meet the doctor at the bedside of their common patient; often she is left without directions at all, or they are filtered through the muddled brain of some woman or child, till they are utterly incomprehensible. Some doctors will take the trouble to leave written orders at each house, and then the nurse can work with confidence. An objection to district nurses put forward in the *Illustrated London News*, and often heard in ordinary conversation, that they make one more in an already overcrowded room, that an extra person always means extra work and meals, &c., is, of course, an absurd confounding of the duties of district and private nurses. The first mentioned do not

take their meals in the homes of their patients, and, when it is necessary to sit by the bedside of a sick person in an overcrowded room, they probably see to the ventilation, which would otherwise have been neglected. Such is the work of district nurses, by which many persons are nursed much more cheaply than would be possible in a hospital, and which encourages habits of independence and thrift. The great disadvantage so far has been that the system has been carried on by isolated groups, which have often had to struggle against want of funds. The need of organization and a common centre has long been felt, for where two or three nurses live long together they are apt to sink into a narrow groove; discipline gets lax, ambition fades, and they sadly need the companionship and moral support of fellow-workers. The Committee nominated by the Queen to consider the best object to which to devote the Women's Jubilee Offering wisely advocated the establishment of such a central institution, with branches all over the country, and to which existing institutions could be affiliated. Women are notably more in need of discipline and methodical habits than men, but they are also more amenable to rules and regulations, and once a scheme for their guidance is completed there will be found no lack of nurses ready to bow to its rules and carry out its precepts. With such a sum as £70,000 it ought to be easy to establish the whole concern on a businesslike basis, and provide for the training and supplying of superior nurses wherever they are required by the poor. It is to be hoped that in the carrying out of this scheme the country parochial nurse will not be forgotten. Only the general practitioner in a rural parish knows all the eccentricities of country nursing, and he alone can appreciate the good done by the parochial nurse. In all weathers she trudges from cottage to cottage, along dirty lanes, or across lonely heaths; she notes the temperature of the fever patient, and sends for the doctor when necessary; and if, as is often the case, the hamlet where she ministers is several miles from the town where the doctor dwells, she may be entrusted with the morphia-needle, to save the weary medical man from a long drive on a winter's night. Perhaps no one leads a more lonely and unselfish life than the nurse of a country parish who does her duty; so let her have the meed of sympathy and companionship that association with a large central institution will be sure to give her.

When we turn to consider the life led by a hospital nurse, we find her the recipient of most of the blessings denied to the district nurse. In the hospital are regular hours and scientific training; lectures and classes and examinations urge the nurse on to make the most of her powers; and as soon as she proves herself intelligent and capable, she can be sure of steady advancement. She enjoys the advantage of a medical library; she has the company of numerous fellow-workers; she hears lectures delivered by some of the best

physicians and surgeons of the day ; and it is her own fault if, while waiting on her patients, her moral and intellectual qualities are not strengthened every day. In what way, then, do these women need external sympathy and help ? A glance at the daily labour demanded of a hospital nurse will soon show. A day-nurse rises at six, and is in her ward by seven ; the first morning duty is to sweep and thoroughly clean the long ward, and to make perhaps ten beds—many of which are occupied by helpless patients. As soon as the doctors arrive the nurse has to wait on them ; if there is a serious operation in the theatre, the nurse must be present. All day long she has to attend to the innumerable wants of the ten sick persons under her charge. She has no sooner put a poultice on one, than she has to rub in a liniment for another ; she has no sooner filled an ice-bag, than it is time to serve the dinners. Swiftly, unceasingly, she passes from one duty to another, till the day wanes and night approaches ; and then, when the clock strikes half-past nine, she goes away to her supper and then to her bed. During this long day of fourteen hours and a half the only rest of which she is absolutely sure, is the half-hour devoted to dinner ; though in most hospitals the authorities try to secure to each nurse either an hour or two hours off duty, during which she can get fresh air and change of scene. A night-nurse is on duty for twelve hours at a stretch ; her work is physically much lighter, but intellectually it is far inferior to attendance on the doctors during the day. Now this life is intensely interesting, and you find no lack of noble women ready to leave the trivial sphere to which their labours are usually confined, and accept these prominent posts in the great conflict against pain and death. But though the spirit is willing the flesh is weak, and after a few years of this constant bodily and mental strain a woman is sure to show signs of failing health or premature old age. It is estimated that the average length of a nurse's stay in a hospital is about twelve years, and during that time her services are remunerated at about the rate of £25 per annum. This is where the evil of the hospital system comes in : it uses up the best years of a woman's life, and then leaves her to secure support in her old age as best she can. Of course, many nurses on leaving the hospital go to county infirmaries or private institutions, and some obtain posts as matrons or superintendents ; still there is always a residue of those who, having expended their talents in the service of the poor and suffering, are left, when they themselves are weak and poverty-stricken, to struggle along as best they can. Even though it be acknowledged that women are naturally improvident and unbusiness-like, it must be admitted that no adequate provision for old age can be saved on such small wages earned for so short a period, especially as a nurse often has to help to maintain some relative who is partly dependent on her. Here, then, it is that the National

Pension Fund will step in and organize a species of benevolent societies for these nurses : take care of their interests, encourage them to save, grant aid during sickness, and secure annuities for the aged and infirm. The great need of combination amongst nurses had been felt for years, but the small savings of the nurses were inadequate to start a common fund, and extraneous aid was necessary to give the idea a start. Thanks to the great generosity of Messrs. Gibbs, Hambro, J. S. Morgan, and Rothschild, and to the indefatigable zeal of Mr. Burdett, this need can now be met, and from the already over-taxed brain of the nurse can be banished all fear of an uncared-for future. Over a thousand nurses have signified their desire to subscribe to such a fund, and, since there are quite 15,000 nurses in the United Kingdom, many more will doubtless rush to register their names now the scheme is started. There is strength in numbers, and there is small fear but the munificence of our four City merchants will be promptly appreciated and supported.

Lastly, let us turn to those institutions which provide trained nurses for the well-to-do. Some are very old-established societies, patronized by special doctors, and carrying on a steady orderly business. The most modern institutions are generally connected with the large hospitals, and have a large supply of nurses fresh from their training. A staff of over a hundred nurses is not unusual in one of these establishments, and all domestic arrangements are under the care of a lady superintendent. The home seldom contains beds for more than a third of the nurses, for they often pass from one case to another with only a day's rest between. The charge for these nurses varies from 30s. to £5 5s. a week, and the nurse herself receives about £50 a year. The life led by these nurses is very strange and varied : now tending a child in some great mansion, where there is a servant specially told off to wait on them ; then nursing a young wife in a suburban villa, where there is only a maid-of-all-work, and a dearth of what are commonly regarded as the necessaries of life. To fulfil her duty wherever she may find herself, and to give satisfaction to all, a nurse must possess infinite tact and patience, be a rapid observer, and quick to read the characters of those with whom she comes in contact. The cheerfulness which may brighten one patient may be regarded as obtrusive chatter by another ; the constant attentions which will soothe one will irritate the next. The nurse who pleases all must indeed be a wonder. It is reported that a celebrated physician remarked to a patient whom a constant succession of nurses had failed to satisfy—"You had better send to heaven, my dear sir, and demand a hospital-trained angel with a cast iron back." The financial circumstances of these nurses are a little better than those of their hospital sisters, but their duties are every whit as trying. When the doctor lives far away the responsibility they incur in cases of danger is great, and often their periods of rest

are constantly broken by anxious friends. And frequently, when the patient gets better, the nurse is regarded as a nuisance, and her former devotion is forgotten. It is to be regretted that some institutions, which are merely business speculations, choose their nurses with so little discrimination that discreditable specimens are sometimes met with, who throw disgrace on the entire community. As a matter of fact, perfection is no more to be found amongst nurses than other human beings, and yet these women must be sustained by worthy motives to labour so diligently for so scant an earthly reward. It will indeed be a blessing to many to think that the nurses are to have the practical benefit of a charitable scheme, and that the cases of destitution and misery in their ranks, of which every matron has had cognizance, will now be tales of the past.

It is these heroic women who find their way into every household, from the castle to the cellar tenement; who, wherever pain and sickness are rife, come with skilful hands and sympathizing hearts to heal and bless. Facing without fear the risk of infection, a nurse will make her home in a fever hospital; or, beside the dying bed of some poor wretch, will risk contagion of an even more fearful nature. These are the women who never bow down to what Mr. Stevenson calls the "bestial goddesses of Comfort and Respectability;" who can perform the most menial services with dignity, and to whom nothing is common or unclean. These are the women who carry, wherever they go, an atmosphere of noble labour and unselfish enterprise which brings to this work-a-day world a gleam of the glory to come. It is the nurse whose purity and truth breaks through the crust of scepticism with which our souls were crusted over, and opens once more the stream of love and faith which flooded our being in our youth. Before the keen light of earnestness in a nurse's eyes the froth and frivolity of social life dries up to nothing, and in its stead grow noble aspirations. The influence exercised far and wide by a nurse is almost unbounded, and if she be actuated by the fervent love of humanity which urges many women to undertake this work, she can carry everywhere with her a glorious torch to light all upwards towards more sublime and unselfish aims, lifting them for awhile above the trivial commonplaceness of which too many of us are liable to allow our lives to consist.

HENRY GRATTAN.

It has been well said by a distinguished statesman, the leader of the Liberal party in Great Britain, that the opponents of the policy of Home Rule for Ireland have made amongst themselves a kind of three-fold self-denying ordinance. The first point of this ordinance is never to have any regard to history at all; the second is never to pay attention to any experience derivable from foreign countries; and the third point is never to derive any lesson from our own experience in our own colonies throughout the British Empire. It must be admitted that these gentlemen are wise in their generation. Knowing full well that history condemns them at every point, they act upon the maxim that discretion is the better part of valour, and for the most part eschew altogether all reference to the teachings and experience of the past. Some of them, indeed, are rash enough to break away from their fellows, to have nothing to say to the self-denying ordinance, but boldly to contend that the dissatisfaction and discontent which are now rife in the sister island have not in reality sprung from the past misgovernment of that country, but are simply the work of the agitators and demagogues of to-day. How shallow and superficial a view this is, we may learn from the former utterances of one of the most prominent leaders of the so-called Unionist party. Speaking in Dublin in 1866, in his earlier and, as many will think, his better days, Mr. John Bright used the following remarkable words: "There are some who say that the great misfortune of Ireland is in the existence of the noxious race of political agitators. Well, as to that, I may state that the most distinguished political agitators that have appeared during the last hundred years in Ireland are Grattan and O'Connell, and I should say that he must be either a very stupid or a very base Irishman who would wish to erase the achievements of Grattan and O'Connell from the annals of his country." We propose in the present paper to consider very briefly what were the most noteworthy achievements of Grattan, and we take, as our principal authority for this purpose, Grattan's Life, by his Son, of which Mr. Lecky has, with equal truth and moderation, said that it is

¹ *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Rt. Hon. Henry Grattan.* By his son, Henry Grattan, Esq., M.P. In five vols. London. 1849. *The Speeches of the Right Hon. Henry Grattan.* Edited by his Son. In four vols. London. 1822.

probably the best history of Ireland for the period with which it deals.

Henry Grattan, then, was born in Dublin in the year 1746. His father, James Grattan, was for many years Recorder of the city of Dublin. He was likewise one of the members for the city, having Dr. Lucas as his colleague. The two members were in perpetual collision, the Recorder being the legal adviser and champion of the Corporation, and Dr. Lucas its untired, undaunted, and unceasing enemy. Of the Recorder we are told that his principles were aristocratic. "He fancied himself a Whig in politics, but he was, in fact, a Tory." Grattan's mother, Mary Grattan, was a member of the ancient family of Marlay, or De Merly. She was the daughter of the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, and the sister of Colonel Marlay, who fought under Prince Ferdinand at the battle of Minden, and of Richard Marlay, who entered the Church, and became successively Bishop of Clonfert and Bishop of Waterford. After his military experiences were over, the Colonel lived in retirement at Marlay Abbey, which was situated on the banks of the Liffey, about ten miles from Dublin. This spot had already been rendered famous in the early portion of the century as the abode of the unfortunate Vanessa; and it was here that in a few years' time Grattan was destined to plan and to perfect his measures for securing the legislative independence of his country. In Colonel Marlay Grattan found a warm and sincere friend, as well as a steadfast and unflinching political ally. Like the Colonel, the Bishop possessed the feelings of an Irishman, and, as he sat in the Irish Parliament at the time when the Act of Union was carried, he had the melancholy satisfaction of voting and recording his protest against that measure.

Grattan's boyhood was passed in Dublin, and he was in due course sent to two Dublin schools—that of Mr. Ball, in Great Ship Street, and that of Mr. Young, in Abbey Street. We have the testimony of several of his contemporaries to the fact that whilst at school he was considered a boy of great spirit, and was highly respected by his schoolfellows. In the year 1763, at the age of seventeen, Grattan entered Dublin College. There he made the acquaintance of John Fitzgibbon, afterwards Earl of Clare, and of Foster, afterwards Speaker of the Irish House of Commons. Grattan and Fitzgibbon were rivals at the University, as in later life they were antagonists in the political arena. At College Grattan formed many friendships, the most intimate and enduring being that with Mr. W. Broome. Of him we are informed that he was a good classical scholar, and possessed a great taste for poetry. The two young men were attracted to each other by the similarity of their dispositions and their tastes. They were both devoted to literary pursuits, and alike ardently attached to the country and rural life. Many of Grattan's letters to Broome have been preserved, and they form by no means the least interesting

portion of his biography. In them we discover a strange and morbid melancholy that was altogether alien to the later habit of his mind. The moodiness that for a time seems to have settled upon him, was, in all probability, due to the estrangement that had taken place between him and his father. Even at this early age, Grattan had begun to give expression to those Liberal sentiments and patriotic aspirations with which his name will for ever be associated in history. The narrow and unbending Toryism of the father was outraged at the spectacle of his son adopting Liberal politics; and he carried his resentment so far as to mark his displeasure in his will, bequeathing away from his son the paternal mansion that had been in the family for upwards of a century. Writing about this time to his friend Broome, Grattan says: "If you want my company, I am sure I want yours. A fluctuation of sentiment, a listless indolence, and the gloomy reflections that arise from it make the chaos of my mind. But of this no more. A man who is not happy finds his principal comfort in painting his disquietude." In reading and in the cultivation of the muse, Grattan sought such consolation and relaxation as it is in their power to afford. "My muse," he writes, "is at best but a slattern, and stumbles frequently in her passage. She visits me but seldom, and her productions are rather the effort of her mind than the nature of it." Even reading had ceased to afford the exquisite enjoyment and delight that he had at one time been accustomed to derive from it. There was, he said, a time when he felt with every book he read and every line he wrote, but now he could read the most beautiful authors, and behold the most delightful landscape, without emotion. Still, he did not give up reading. On the contrary, he read Bolingbroke constantly, and found him excellent as a reasoner and an orator, whilst Virgil and Pope were his favourites among the poets.

In the year 1767 he went to London, and was entered in Michaelmas Term as student of the Middle Temple. He was supposed to be devoting himself to the study of the law, but as regards studying law at the age of twenty-one in London, says his biographer, that seldom seriously occupies the mind or the time of any Templar. Grattan was hardly an exception to the rule. Politics with him was a passion, and his dissipation took the form of listening to debates at the bar of the Lords or in the galleries of the House of Commons. He was charmed and fascinated in a special degree by Lord Chatham, and he has left upon record a most brilliant and masterly description of the greatest of English orators. The passage is a lengthy one, but, as it forms an admirable example of Grattan's style at its best, we make no apology for quoting it.

"Lord Chatham," he writes, "was a man of great genius, great flight of mind. His imagination was astonishing. I heard him several times when I was at the Temple—on the American war, on the

King's Speech in 1770. and on the privilege of Parliament. He was very great, and very odd. He spoke in a style of conversation, not however what I expected; it was not a speech, for he never came with a prepared harangue; his style was not regular oratory, like Cicero or Demosthenes, but it was very fine and very elevated, and above the ordinary subjects of discourse. . . . What Cicero says, in his *Clavis Oratoribus*, exactly applies—'Formæ dignitas, corporis motus plenus et artis et venustatis, vocis et suavitas et magnitudo.' His gesture was always graceful. . . . He was often called to order. On one occasion he had said, 'I hope some dreadful calamity will befall the country that will open the eyes of the King,' and then he introduced the allusion to the figure drawing the curtains of Priam, and gave the quotation. He was called to order. He stopped, and said, 'What I have spoken I have spoken conditionally, *but now I retract the condition.* I speak it absolutely, and I do hope that some signal calamity will befall the country;' and he repeated what he had said. He then fired, and oratorized, and grew extremely eloquent. Ministers, seeing what a difficult character they had to deal with, thought it best to let him proceed.

"On one occasion, addressing Lord Mansfield, he said, 'Who are the evil advisers of his Majesty? I would say to them, Is it you? Is it you? Is it you?'—(pointing to the Ministers until he came near Lord Mansfield). There were several lords round him, and Lord Chatham said, 'My lords, please to take your seats.' When they had sat down, he pointed to Lord Mansfield, and said, 'Is it you? *Methinks Felix trembles!*' It required a great actor to do this; done by any one else it would have been miserable. . . . When he came to the argumentative part of his speech, he lowered his tone so as to be scarcely audible, and he did not lay so much stress on those parts as on the great bursts of genius and the sublime passages. He had studied action, and his gesture was graceful, and had a most powerful effect. His speeches required good acting, and he gave it them. The impression was great. His manner was dramatic. In this it was said that he was too much the mountebank; but if so, it was a great mountebank. Perhaps he was not so great a debater as his son, but he was a much better orator, a better scholar, and a far greater mind. *Great subjects, great empires, great characters, effulgent ideas, and classical illustrations* formed the materials of his speeches."

Listening to Chatham, and to Burke, and to Fox, and studying the models of classical antiquity, Grattan was, during these years of his residence in London, laying the foundations of his future greatness. Much time and much labour were required to bring his own style of speaking to that pitch of perfection that led Byron to sing of him as—

“Ever glorious Grattan ! the best of the good,
 So simple in heart, so sublime in the rest !
 With all which Demosthenes wanted endued,
 And his rival or victor in all he possessed.”

Several amusing anecdotes are told of the difficulties into which he was brought by his passion for recitation. His landlady on one occasion imagined that he was deranged, and complained to one of his friends that the gentleman used to walk up and down in her garden most of the night, speaking to himself, or addressing an imaginary person called “Mr. Speaker.” On another occasion Grattan amused his friends at breakfast by telling them of an adventure that had befallen him in the course of the previous night in Windsor Forest. In one of his midnight rambles he stopped at a gibbet, and commenced apostrophizing the chains in his usual animated strain, when he suddenly felt a tap on his shoulder, and on turning about was accosted by an unknown person : “How the devil did you get down ?” . To which the rambler calmly replied, “Sir, I suppose you have an interest in that question !”

It was to Windsor Forest that Grattan retired on hearing the news of the death of his sister Catherine, to whom he was deeply attached. Her goodness, her manners, her accomplishments, he tells his friend Broome, entitled her to the highest regard—the most disinterested friendship, the warmest affection, and the meekest gentleness united in her composition. The death of his sister was soon followed by that of his mother, of whom he was always accustomed to speak in the most passionate and affecting terms. “You were the only woman in the world,” he wrote, shortly after her decease, “who loved me. I blush that I bear your death with such tranquillity. The love you bore me, the thousand kindnesses I have received from you, your tenderness, your anxiety, your liberality, your maternal concern for me, are a most affecting and wounding consideration. To remember these obligations with the gratitude they deserve makes your death insupportable.”

Besides Catherine, who died, Grattan had another sister, who was married to Mr. Gervase Parker Bushe, a Member of Parliament, and a gentleman of fortune and position in the county of Kilkenny. It was through his instrumentality that Grattan became acquainted with Flood. These two illustrious Irishmen, afterwards such bitter rivals, were for a time the most intimate of friends. They declaimed together, they acted in private theatricals together, and they wrote together a series of articles against Lord Townshend's Government, which were subsequently collected in a publication called *Baratariana*, from Sancho Panza's island city of Barataria. In private life Flood was one of the most agreeable and charming of men. No one, says Grattan's biographer, knew the practical art of reasoning in private better than Mr. Flood did. He never contradicted ; he

listened patiently; and if he differed, he never introduced altercations. Grattan himself bears testimony to the same effect, for, in writing to Broome, he says: "Flood is the most easy and best tempered man in the world, as well as the most sensible."

The two men were delighted with each other's society, and as yet all was peace and friendship between them. Flood was the senior by some fourteen years, and, as might naturally have been expected, Grattan was fortunate enough to derive considerable assistance from his friend and colleague on entering upon a political career. For it is to be noted that Grattan had already discovered that politics was the particular kind of work for which his genius and his talents were best suited. It is true that in Hilary Term, 1772, he had been called to the Irish bar, but his heart seems never to have been very much engrossed with the work of his profession. The duty of studying law, he used to say, had been taken up too late—"not time enough to make me a lawyer, but sufficiently early to make me a dunco." His ways were hardly the ways of the profession, for it is related that on one occasion, when he had failed to win his case, he was so much affected at the result that he returned to his client half the amount of his fee!

In the year 1775 Lord Charlemont's brother, Mr. Caulfield, died, and Grattan was returned as member for the borough of Charlemont in his place. The time was a critical one. The war with the American States had already broken out, and the prophetic declaration of Lord Chatham that the first shot that was fired in America would separate the two countries was at no distant date to be fulfilled. England's extremity was Ireland's opportunity, and the recognition of the legislative independence of Ireland and the acknowledgment of the independence of the United States of America went hand in hand together. In Grattan's own mind the two questions were closely and inextricably associated with each other. Half a dozen years before he entered the Irish House of Commons he had listened to a speech at Westminster that had made an indelible impression on his mind. We have his own authority for this statement: "When I went to London to the Temple," he says, "the first person I heard speak was George Grenville. He talked of American taxation, and of the indisputable law of the realm that gave that right; and he extended this to Ireland. . . . I wrote a reply which I thought was very good, and with much care; but it touched every point, except the question; it stood clear of that. However, this had great effect upon me, and was of much service. It impressed on my mind a horror of this doctrine; and I believe it was owing to this speech of George Grenville's that I became afterwards so very active in my opposition to the principles of British government in Ireland."

Grattan's maiden speech in the Irish Parliament was a declaration

in favour of economy. It was, if not a very brilliant, yet a fairly successful effort, as we learn from the comments of the papers of the day. "Mr. Grattan spoke," we are told, "not a studied speech, but in reply—the spontaneous flow of natural eloquence. Though so young a man, he spoke without hesitation; and if he keeps to this example, will be a valuable weight in the scale of patriotism."

How speedily and how thoroughly this prophecy was verified is now matter of history. In every movement that had for its object the elevation and improvement of his native land he bore a conspicuous and a manly part. It was largely owing to his exertions that the restrictions which had lain like an incubus on Irish trade were removed, and that a certain limited measure of relief was granted to the Roman Catholics. Above all, it was he who was the champion, and, for a time, the successful champion, of the legislative independence of Ireland. It must not be forgotten, however, that a body of men sprang into existence at this period, without whose assistance all Grattan's efforts would have been unavailing—we mean, of course, the Irish Volunteers. One of the consequences of the outbreak of war with the American colonies was that Ireland was denuded of troops. She was exposed, unprotected, to the attacks of her enemies, and especially of France. The inhabitants of Belfast and Carrickfergus appealed to Government for protection, and received a reply to the effect that no greater force than about sixty troopers could be afforded for the purpose. Under these circumstances Ireland proceeded to arm herself, and chose Lord Charlemont as the general of her forces. In a very short time some sixty thousand men were assembled. Their object was twofold, to repel attack and to secure the liberties of their country. To quote the words of one of their own resolutions: "They knew their duty to their sovereign, and they were loyal; they knew their duty to themselves, and they were resolved to be free." At times it seemed as if the two duties might come into conflict with each other, and that England ran some risk of losing Ireland, as she lost the American colonies. "Talk not to me of peace," exclaimed Hussey Burgh, amidst the applause of the Irish House of Commons, "Ireland is not in a state of peace; *it is smothered war*. England has sown her laws like dragons' teeth, and they have sprung up in armed men."

At such a crisis courage and moderation alike were necessary in the leaders of the people. These qualities were possessed by Grattan in the highest degree. Free Trade had been obtained as a result of the efforts that had been put forth by the Opposition, backed by the Volunteers, and many of the most ardent and patriotic Irishmen were disposed to think that their wisest policy, for a time at all events, would be that of resting and being thankful. Such, however, was not the mind and the intention of Grattan. Deserted by the colleagues with whom he had been labouring in the cause of his country, he retired to Marlay Abbey, to hold communion with

himself. Further reflection only tended to confirm him in the belief that a Free Constitution was necessary to make Free Trade permanent and secure. "Along the banks of the Liffey," he writes, "amid the groves and bowers of Swift and Vanessa, I grew convinced that I was right; arguments, unanswerable, came to my mind, and what I then prepared confirmed me in my determination to persevere. A great spirit arose among the people, and the speech which I delivered afterwards in the House communicated its fire and impelled them on; the country caught the flame, and it rapidly extended. I was supported by eighteen counties, by the grand jury addresses, and the resolutions of the Volunteers. *I stood upon that ground, and was determined never to yield.* I brought on the question the 19th April, 1780. *That was a great day for Ireland—that day gave her liberty.*" The speech which he delivered on this occasion Grattan always considered as his best. One who listened to it said, "I was lost in admiration; he spoke as if inspired." The speech concluded with a peroration that has become famous. "I have no ambition," the orator declared, "unless it be the ambition to break your chain and contemplate your glory. I never will be satisfied so long as the meanest cottager in Ireland has a link of the British chain clanking to his rags; he may be naked, he shall not be in iron, and I do see the time is at hand, the spirit is gone forth, the declaration is planted; and though great men should apostatize, yet the cause will live; and though the public speaker should die, yet the immortal fire shall outlast the organ which conveyed it, and the breath of liberty, like the word of the holy man, will not die with the prophet, but survive him." On concluding his speech he proceeded to move, "That the King's most excellent Majesty, and the Lords and Commons of Ireland, are the only power competent to make laws to bind Ireland." No direct vote on this motion was taken; the question was for the moment shelved by means of a side issue; but the feeling of the House was unmistakeable, and the Lord Lieutenant—Lord Buckingham—in reporting the proceedings to Lord Hillsborough, was obliged to make use of the following most significant language: "It is with the utmost concern I must acquaint your lordship that, although so many gentlemen expressed their concern that the subject had been introduced, the sense of the House against the obligation of any statutes of the Parliament of Great Britain within this kingdom is represented to me to have been almost unanimous."

Two more years were to pass before the unanimous sentiment of the Irish House of Commons found expression in legislative action. On April 16, 1782, Grattan moved for the third and last time the Irish Declaration of Independence. A change of Government had taken place in England, and the new Ministers were known to be favourable to the Irish claims. They appealed, however, for delay,

Lord Rockingham and Mr. Fox putting themselves in personal communication with Lord Charlemont and Mr. Grattan on the subject. Lord Charlemont might have been disposed to yield to this seemingly very moderate request, but Grattan once more was inexorable. "No time; no time," he exclaimed, and a reply in accordance with this declaration was immediately transmitted to England. The day of liberation for Ireland was at hand; the prize was within her grasp, and no power on earth must be permitted to snatch it from her. The 16th of April 1782 was indeed a proud day in the life of Grattan and the history of Ireland. Through the parted ranks of the Volunteers the great champion of Irish nationality passed to move the emancipation of his country. Never had orator a nobler task, and never was task more nobly or more triumphantly discharged.

"Deep on his face engraven
Deliberation sat and public care;
And princely counsel in his face yet shone."

In a few glowing sentences he sketched the history of the struggle that had reached at last its consummation and its triumph. "I am now," he exclaimed, "to address a free people: ages have passed away, and this is the first moment in which you could be distinguished by that appellation. I have spoken on the subject of your liberty so often that I have nothing to add, and have only to admire by what heaven-directed steps you have proceeded until the whole faculty of the nation is braced up to the act of her own deliverance. I found Ireland on her knees; I watched over her with an eternal solicitude; I have traced her progress from injuries to arms, and from arms to liberty. Spirit of Swift! spirit of Molyneux! your genius has prevailed! Ireland is now a nation! In that new character I hail her! and, bowing to her august presence, I say, *Esto perpetua!*"

One of the first acts of the liberated Parliament was to vote twenty thousand men to the British navy and £50,000 to Mr. Grattan. The vote of the men was made at Grattan's suggestion, and is one of many instances that might be adduced to prove his loyalty to the British connection. In writing to his friend Day, he said he was desirous, above all things, next to the liberty of his country, not to accustom the Irish mind to an alien and suspicious habit with regard to Great Britain, and his acts did not belie his words. As regards the grant of money to himself, it is to be remarked that the sum originally proposed was £100,000, and that it was with the utmost difficulty that he could be induced to accept the half of this amount.

The year 1782 marked an important turning point in the private no less than the public life of Grattan. In that year he was married to Miss Fitzgerald, a lady who was equally admired for her personal charms and her intellectual accomplishments. Writing to his friend Broome in early life, when the misanthropic fit was upon him,

he said—"Whenever marriage is in the case, I always rejoice I am not the happy man." He had, however, grown wiser with advancing years, and he was, by universal consent, admitted to have been exceptionally fortunate in his choice of a wife. Shortly after his marriage he took up his abode in the country. In one of his early letters he speaks of a visit to the Dargle, in the beautiful county of Wicklow. "I have not," he writes, "forgotten the romantic valley; I look on it with an eye of forecast—it may be the recreation of an active life, or the retreat of an obscure one, or the romantic residence of philosophical friendship." Thither he now went with his bride, taking up his residence in the Vale of Tinnehinch, where he was to spend such a large proportion of the remaining period of his life. His love of the country remained with him to the last, as we may gather from the recollections of the *Table Talk* of Samuel Rogers. "Grattan would say to me," said the poet Rogers, "'Come, Rogers, let's take a walk among the lime-trees, and hear those great senators, the bees; and, while we were listening to their buzzing and humming, he would exclaim, 'Now they are holding a committee,' &c. &c. He would say, too, 'Were I a necromancer, I should like to call up Scipio Africanus: he was not so skilful a captain as Hannibal; but he was a greater and more virtuous man. And I should like to talk to Julius Cæsar on several points of his history—on one particularly (though I would not press the subject, if disagreeable to him): I should wish to know what part he took during Catiline's conspiracy.' 'Should you like to call up Cleopatra?' I asked. 'No,' replied Grattan, 'not Cleopatra: she would tell me nothing but lies; and her beauty would make me sad.' Grattan was so fond of walking with me, that Mrs. Grattan once said to him rather angrily, 'You'll be taken for Mr. Rogers's shadow.'"

But with all his devotion to the country, Grattan continued to his dying day to take the keenest and liveliest interest in public affairs. Unfortunately, it is not possible for us within the limits of a magazine article to enter in any detail into a consideration of the achievements and the failures of the Parliament that will always be known in history under the name of Grattan's Parliament. During the time that it lasted it is admitted on all hands that the material prosperity of Ireland was such as it had never been in any previous period of her history. In support of this proposition we will cite the authority of a hostile witness—Lord Clare. Lord Clare made a speech in 1798, which he subsequently published in pamphlet form. In that speech, speaking of the condition of the country since the emancipation of the Parliament, he said: "There is not a nation on the face of the habitable globe which has advanced in cultivation, in manufactures, with the same rapidity in the same period as Ireland."

Great, however, as was the material, and, in many respects, the

political, progress of Ireland during this period, it cannot be denied that the constitution of Grattan's Parliament was, in certain essential particulars, most grievously and lamentably defective. It was, be it remembered, an exclusively Protestant Parliament, and a Parliament that did not in any real sense partake of a representative character. Not that Grattan is himself to be blamed for these capital defects in the constitution that is called after his name. Whatever may be thought of his conduct at the time when the question of Reform was complicated by the threatening attitude of the Volunteers, it may be confidently asserted that no man strove more ardently and more arduously than he to reform the Parliament and to emancipate the Catholics. The subject of Parliamentary Reform was brought forward by Grattan, in conjunction with Mr. Ponsonby, in the year 1793. Speaking in the debate on that occasion, he said: "The question of Parliamentary Reform is now fairly brought forth; it consists, I think, of two parts—external and internal. The external relates to the creation of the House of Commons; the internal to its corruption. A radical reformation in both is indispensable: first, it is indispensable that the House of Commons should be chosen by the people; second, that, after it is chosen by the people, it should not be bought by the Ministers." In order to secure a proper representation of the people, Grattan sought to pass into law not only a Franchise Bill, but a Pension Bill and a Responsibility Bill as well. In this object he failed, and he failed because of another and a fatal flaw in the Irish Constitution. The executive in Ireland was not an Irish but a British executive. Responsible Government might exist in name, but the reality of responsible Government was absent. Above two-thirds of the seats in the Irish House of Commons were private property, and of those seats many were actually sold to the British Minister, whilst the number of placemen and pensioners sitting in the House was equal to about half of the entire body. "You have no adequate responsibility in Ireland," Grattan had exclaimed, on a previous occasion in 1790, "and politicians laugh at the sword of justice, which falls short of their heads, and only precipitates on their reputations. Sir, this country has never yet exercised herself in the way of vindictive justice. In the case of Strafford she was but an humble assistant; and yet in this country we have had victims—the aristocracy at different times has been a victim; the whole people of Ireland for almost an entire century were a victim; but Ministers in all the criminal successions—here is a chasm, a blank in your history. Sir, you have in Ireland *no axe*—therefore, no good Minister."

But, in spite of the evil influence that was constantly being exerted by the British executive, considerable progress was made in placing Irish freedom on a broad and representative basis. "No

sooner had a national spirit arisen among the Protestants," writes Mr. Lecky, "than the spirit of sectarianism declined." Unlike Flood and Lord Charlemont, Grattan always stood forth as the champion of Catholics and Protestants alike. In 1781 he supported, by his vote and by his speech, Mr. Gardiner's Roman Catholic Bill. "I give my consent to the Bill," he said, "in its principle, extent, and boldness. I give my consent to it as the most likely means of obtaining a victory over the prejudices of the Catholics, and over our own. I give my consent to it, because I would not keep two millions of my fellow-subjects in a state of slavery, and because, as the mover of the Declaration of Rights, I would be ashamed of giving freedom to but six hundred thousand of my countrymen, when I could extend it to two million more." It was in this spirit that he laboured from first to last, nor were his labours entirely without fruit. In the year 1793 a Relief Bill, admitting the Roman Catholics to the elective franchise, was carried, and Grattan's Parliament would unquestionably have proceeded quietly and peacefully along the path of political progress and improvement, if it had not been for the infatuated action of the British Ministry, in recalling Lord Fitzwilliam at the critical moment when Parliamentary reform, in the widest acceptation of that term, was in contemplation, and when the Catholic claims, in their fullest extent, were on the point of being conceded. The golden opportunity was lost, and the hopes of the Catholics were dashed to the ground.

"Ex illo fluere ac retro sublapsa referri
Spes Danaüm."

The British Ministry acted with their eyes open. They were solemnly warned by Lord Fitzwilliam of the danger of hesitation or of resistance to the claims of the Roman Catholics. The Lord-Lieutenant, for his part, resolutely refused to be the person "to raise a flame in the country that nothing short of arms could keep down," and he left it to the British Ministers to determine whether, if he was not to be supported, he ought not to be removed. Removed he was accordingly, and, as a consequence, Ireland was plunged into the horrors of civil war, and the Catholic question was thrown back for upwards of a generation.

The state of the country went from bad to worse, and the position of public affairs became such that Grattan came to the conclusion that no good purpose would be served by his continuing any longer in Parliament. At the general election in 1790 he had been returned, along with Lord Henry Fitzgerald, as one of the members for the City of Dublin, and, as another dissolution was now imminent, he gave notice to his constituents that it was not his intention to seek re-election. There was, he felt, no place for him in public life at this time. On the one hand, he could not support the United Irishmen, who were for appealing to physical force and for calling in

the assistance of the French—"Touch not this plant of Gallic growth," said Grattan, "its taste is death, though 'tis not the tree of knowledge"—on the other hand, he was vehemently opposed to the policy of the Government, which was nothing more nor less than a policy of brutal and barbarous coercion. A Convention Act had been passed with the object of enabling the Government to put down all popular exertions throughout Ireland. Grattan denounced the Act as "an anti-Whig and anti-constitutional measure, and the boldest step that ever yet was made to introduce a military Government." He condemned the policy of coercion, root and branch, and dwelt with unanswerable force and logic on the failure of that policy. The Government had taken their stand on the report of a Secret Committee of the Irish Parliament, and contended that the people must be subdued before they were relieved. Grattan proceeded to examine this contention, and to prove the futility of it. He also had studied the report of the Secret Committee, and had drawn from it a diametrically opposite conclusion. "It appears," he said, "from that report, that, just as your system of coercion advanced, the United Irishmen advanced—that the measures you took to coerce, strengthened—to disperse, collected—to disarm, armed—and to render them weak and odious, made them popular and powerful—whereas, on the other hand, you have loaded Parliament and Government with the odium of an oppressive system, and with the further odium of rejecting these two popular topics—Parliamentary Reform and Catholic Emancipation—which you allow are the most likely to gain the heart of the nation, and to be the beloved objects of the people." The orator then proceeded to examine in detail the respective merits and demerits of the policy of Conciliation and the policy of Coercion, and concluded with the following declaration: "We have offered our measure—you will reject it; we deprecate yours—you will persevere. Having no hopes left to persuade or to dissuade, and having discharged our duty, we shall trouble you no more, and after this day shall not attend the House of Commons." Accordingly, in the year 1797 Grattan retired from Parliament. No long time elapsed, however, before he was summoned back again by the call of duty and of country. Two years later the Government Bill for suppressing the Irish Parliament, and merging it in the British Parliament at Westminster, was rejected by 109 votes to 104. Dublin was illuminated, and the people manifested their delight at the defeat of the project of a Union. But their triumph was short-lived, and every one foresaw that the conflict would be renewed at the earliest possible date. At this critical juncture Grattan was ultimately induced by his wife and by his friends to seek and to obtain re-election to the Irish House of Commons. When the news was brought to him that he had been chosen member for the county of Wicklow, he exclaimed, "Oh, here they come; why will they not let me die

in peace?" "The question of Union," writes his wife, "had become dreadful to him; he could not bear the idea, or listen to the subject, or speak on it, with any degree of patience; he grew quite wild and it almost drove him frantic." His friends found him ill and in bed, but although the hour was five o'clock in the morning, he rose at once, dressed in the uniform of the Volunteers, and allowed himself to be taken to the House of Commons, where the debate on the proposals of the Government was still proceeding. His presence produced for the moment quite an electrical effect, and he was heard with rapt attention, whilst for the space of two hours he poured forth a stream of fiery and eloquent indignation and appeal. "He, the Minister," exclaimed the orator, who spoke as one risen from the dead, "'his budget with corruption crammed,' proposes to you to give up the ancient inheritance of your country; to proclaim an utter and blank incapacity, and to register this proclamation of incapacity in an act which inflicts on this ancient nation an eternal disability; and he accompanies these monstrous proposals by undisguised terror and unqualified bribery; and this he calls no attack on the honour and dignity of the kingdom! The thing he proposes to buy is what cannot be sold—liberty! For it he has nothing to give." If the Irish Parliament could have been saved by eloquence, assuredly Grattan would have saved it. Matters, however, had already gone too far, and all the efforts put forth by the Opposition were unavailing. "Venit summa dies, et ineluctabile tempus." All that an Irish patriot could do was to enter his protest against the destruction of the liberties of his country and to look to the future for vindication and redress. It was in this spirit that on May 26, 1800, Grattan made his last speech in the Irish House of Commons. "The constitution may for a time be lost," he said, "yet I do not give up the country. I see her in a swoon, but she is not dead. Though in her tomb she lies helpless and motionless, still there is on her lips a spirit of life, and on her cheeks a glow of beauty.

" 'Thou art not conquered; beauty's ensign yet
Is crimson on thy lips and in thy cheeks,
And death's pale flag is not advanced there.'

While a plank of the vessel sticks together I will not leave her. Let the courtier present his flimsy sail, and carry the light barque of his faith with every new breath of wind—I will remain anchored here, with fidelity to the fortunes of my country, faithful to her freedom—faithful to her fall!" Further resistance could be of no avail; "and accordingly," says Grattan, "finding all useless, we retired, with safe consciences, but with breaking hearts." This was the saddest day in Grattan's memorable career, as the proudest was that on which he carried the declaration of the legislative independence of his country. "There are two days in the Irish history," he was accustomed to say, "that I can never forget. The one on which

we gained freedom. How great the triumph! How moderate! How well it was borne—with what dignity and with all absence of vulgar triumph! I shall ever remember the joy of that occasion! The other was the day in which we lost our Parliament. It was a savage act, done by a set of assassins who were brought into the House to sell their country and themselves; they did not belong to Ireland: some were soldiers, all were slaves. Everything was shame, and hurry, and base triumph!" Speaking of the emancipated Parliament of Ireland, on another occasion, he said, with concentrated force and beauty: "I watched by its cradle, I followed its hearse."

The story of the remaining portion of Grattan's life is soon told. When the Act of Union was carried, he retired once again to Tinnehinch. Five years later, at the earnest solicitation of Lord Fitzwilliam and Mr. Fox, he consented to enter the British Parliament. He sat for a short time as member for Malton in Yorkshire, and from 1806 to the day of his death represented the City of Dublin. The experiment of becoming a member of the Parliament at Westminster was a hazardous one. Flood had already made it, and had failed. He was, as Grattan finely said of him, "an oak of the forest, too old and too great to be transplanted at fifty." Unlike Flood, however, Grattan won most remarkable oratorical triumphs in the British, no less than in the Irish Parliament. The theme upon which he was never tired of descanting was that of the Catholic claims, and his eloquent appeals to the British public on this question doubtless helped to pave the way for the growth of more liberal and tolerant feelings between the Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects of the Crown. When his end was fast approaching, he drew up a paper containing his last wish and desire, which was that Ireland should never seek for any connection except with Great Britain, and that Great Britain should help to repeal the civil and political disabilities of the Catholics. "I die," he said, "with a love of liberty in my heart and this declaration in favour of my country in my hand." After this he grew very weak—got his family close around him—bowed down his head, and at six o'clock in the morning of the 4th of June 1820 tranquilly and happily expired. He was buried, amidst an Empire's lamentation, in the North Transept of Westminster Abbey.

"Ne'er to those chambers where the mighty rest,
Since their foundation, came a nobler guest,
Nor e'er was to the bowers of bliss conveyed,
A purer spirit or more holy shade."

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF AMERICAN CITIES.

THE most wonderful feature in the growth and expansion of the young nation in the vast territory covered by the United States is the number and variety of its cities. The enemies of Protection claim that the extent and magnitude of these centres of population are proofs of the slowly demoralizing influences of the doctrine which they detest: that the stimulus to home manufactures, which results in the building of centres and outlets for them, is a mere diversion of the national force, which might be more symmetrically distributed; and that millions of men and women in America would be infinitely better off had they never migrated from country to city. The ungenerous advocates of a "know-nothing" policy like that of other days mourn because the invading Irish, Danes, and Swedes, the thrifty English and Scotch, and the economical and pushing German buy up the farms which have been deserted by the native tillers of the soil, who grow weary of rusticity, and "move in" to adjacent cities, where they can enjoy the benefits, and where they take the risk of the curses, of co-operation. In the populous Eastern sections of the United States, the farmer's son quits the homestead at an early age; he hates the sight of moss-grown roofs, decaying, venerable fences, and dilapidated buildings; the immemorial meadows and historic pastures have for him no charm, and he prefers a precarious existence as a mechanic, or a professional, or commercial man in the city, where he has side-walks, gas and electric lights, daily journals, the theatre, the fashionable "saloon," the hotel corridor (a public lounging place in American cities), rather than the certain, but hard and somewhat joyless, independence of the farmer. If he is capable, as well as industrious, he pays off the inevitable mortgage on the paternal acres, and often brings the old folks to town, a change in their existence which they seem to accept readily enough. All over New England and the Middle States this migration from country to city is steadily going on; and every day and every hour the foreign peasant, emancipated and enlightened by the very nature of his surroundings, is silently occupying the deserted farmhouses and acres. The O'Briens and M'Gallaghans, the Durands and La Places, the Steins and Gründlers, the Aksakoffs and Levys, are in the places

of the Smiths and Allens, and Emersons and Thorpes, and Coreys and Cheneys, and Winthropes. The Yankee has gone to "town," and there he proposes to remain. For him the country has become simply a place in which to grow hay and vegetables, to spend summer vacations in, a tract to whiz through in railway journeys, mainly taken at night. Even when he is rich, he does not take that delight in a country house which is so marked a characteristic of Europeans. Perhaps he does not need the country house so much, for many of his cities are simply grown-up villages, not hemmed in and stifled. No remnants of the rude times of old, no frowning fortifications rendering narrow and uncomfortable streets and high and gloomy houses necessary, are to be found in the United States. If the farmer has come to town he has brought with him, unconsciously, a feeling for fresh air and space, for "front yards" and orchards, which has been instrumental in beautifying many a city site that would otherwise have been most ordinary.

Doubtless the multiplication of manufactures has operated as a powerful magnet to draw the populations of New England, the Middle States, and many regions of the nearer West and South into the cities. An enterprising capitalist suddenly discovered that it was no longer needful, thanks to the heavy duties on foreign goods established by Protection, to import gloves from England and France. He established a manufactory of gloves in a thriving town, which soon changed its primitive name for the more explicit one of Gloversville. He at first sent out the work to be done "by the piece" in the surrounding farmhouses, reserving only the finishing for the manufactory. By-and-by the industry grew; rivals appeared in the field, and North Gloversville was created. The farmers' daughters and sons, interested in the village life by their new employment, were gradually drawn to Gloversville and North Gloversville, and did not return to the homesteads. Presently, Gloversville and North Gloversville were united by a street, and formed one "city," with a mayor, a common council, a board of aldermen, and a police force of five men, with a "chief." The farmers' sons were transformed into members of the city government; and a farmer's daughter became the wife of the mayor. United Gloversville, in its local newspapers, extolled the progress of civilization attainable only in cities, and a farmer's son, wielding the editorial pen, ridiculed the slowness and steadiness of the rural community from which he himself had sprung. An occasional epidemic, a financial crash, or formidable immorality were not regarded as incidents arising from the crowding into cities, but as the penalties for weaknesses inherent in human nature, and as possible in country as in town.

This is by no means an imaginary case; it is the history of the growth of hundreds of large communities throughout the United

States. But the encouragement given to home manufactures is by no means the main incentive to the desertion of the country districts by the native American. Neither is the cause of that desertion to be found in any unworthy disdain of agriculture as a pursuit; but rather in a deliberate rejection of small farming by every person who is blessed with ambition and active wits, because he is anxious for luxury, quick riches, excitement, struggles, social attrition. Even if he can only decorate his career with a succession of partial failures, he prefers such a life to the study of the changes in the weather, to the watching of the slow maturing of crops and stock. He wishes to bring the world to his door; to feel that five or six railways open avenues from his chosen residence to the world at large; that the magical band of the telegraph binds him to Paris and Pekin. He subscribes to all new inventions, not merely because they impress him as useful and pleasing, but because he wishes to "keep up his city's record." "We have more telephones in operation in Leadville than there are in all Paris to-day," said a citizen of Colorado's mushroom community four or five years ago, and he triumphantly proved this statement. The newly enriched inhabitant of a city will give twenty, fifty, or a hundred thousand dollars to the foundation of a risky new enterprise, simply because he wishes to check the audacity or the rivalry of a neighbouring town. He knows that in his obituary notice this donation will be cited, and that it will be followed by the words "esteemed and enterprising old resident, always foremost in promoting the good of the city." He feels the same proud interest in his city that the Frenchman takes in his family: he might leave ten thousand dollars to a university, and nothing to his only son, if the latter happened to be worthless; but the Frenchman would need to be stirred by an earthquake before he would do this.

Our business in the present article is not, however, so much with the causes of the fact that two-fifths of the population of the United States are in cities, as with the memories and extremely varied aspects of those cities, old and new, whether sprung from the stimulation of our manufactures, or grown up naturally within the last two and a half centuries because of their geographical positions, carved out of the wilderness in obedience to the demands of those mighty moving forces, the locomotive or electric telegraph, or sprung up on coal and iron and lime-stone beds, or beside fat slopes reeking with petroleum, or on prairies from which are annually exported almost countless thousands of cattle and swine and millions upon millions of bushels of grain. Although in passing these cities in review we may not find any marked diversity of architecture, we shall discover, in sites and surrounding scenery, in character and composition of population, in temperament and degrees of energy, the very

widest range. The saints have bestowed their revered names upon many cities in America; but have allowed Saint Paul and Saint Augustine to be utterly diverse, Saint Louis and San Francisco to have little in common. The pious fervour of the early Catholic explorers has left its mark on the nomenclature, but on nothing else. The very manner in which the names of the saint-christened towns are pronounced by the resident generations in this nineteenth century shows that for them the saintly appellation has lost its meaning. In like manner no dweller in Manhattan ever thinks of *New York* in contradistinction to the *old York* beyond the sea. He pronounces the name as if it were all one word. But listen to the Englishman. In his unctuous emphasis on the *New*, you at once find ample recognition of the old York, and explanation of the origin of the name. Two things must invariably impress the intelligent foreigner for the first time travelling through the United States. The first is the large number of cities near each other—so much at variance with his preconceived notions about a “new country.” Boston, with its 400,000 people and with its five and twenty or thirty tributary cities, each ranging from 30,000 to 60,000 population, is but six hours from New York, with 1,100,000, and Brooklyn—“the old bedroom of New York”—with its 600,000, and Jersey City with its 150,000. Close at hand, too, are Newark with 130,000 and a number of minor cities, on the great route to Philadelphia, with its 900,000, and Baltimore, with its 400,000, and Washington, with its 150,000. There are no such city centres as these in most continental countries, and in Great Britain nothing exactly comparable to it. In a Latin country, it would be impossible for two cities of the size of New York and Philadelphia to exist within three hours of each other: the “centralization” would inevitably build up one at the expense of the other. If Chateaubriand could return to earth, and take a journey over the section which he visited when it was a wilderness a hundred years ago, what would he say to this splendid chain of cities, each vying with each in commerce, in the creation of institutions of learning, in amassing wealth, and in securing the greatest good of the greatest number? He would fancy himself the victim of some phantasmagoria. The generous rivalry of States, the active individual initiative so general in America, the constant influx of foreign population, and the vast manufacturing interests of the last thirty years, have done in one century what, under a different system or series of systems, could not have been accomplished in five hundred years.

The number and importance of these cities would impress the foreigner, but no more than one other and singular fact, especially if he happened to be familiar with the English language—viz., the fact that from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oregon—a distance of more than three thousand miles—no trace of a distinct dialect is to

be found. The man from Maine, even though he may be of inferior education and limited capacity, can completely understand the man of Oregon. There is no peasant with a *patois*; there is no rough Northumbrian burr; in point of fact, there is no brogue. The nasal twang of the dweller on the Atlantic coast is lost in the soft and misty climate of the North Pacific; the sharp and aggressive tone of the New Yorker is not at all like the mellow and persuasive accents of the dweller in New Orleans; but no dialect offers its barrier; no farmer turns away his head when you ask him the way on the road, and answers that he does not understand; no section boasts of a written and spoken language differing from the official one of the country; there are no thirteen names for a plough in as many separate townships, as there are in a certain district in Southern France. A traveller, well known to us, while making an extensive journey on horseback, in the heart of the wild North Carolina mountains, encountered a country maiden who complained that "You-uns do not talk like we-uns," but she was obliged to confess that she understood everything said to her. Phrases, forms of expression, words taken from the soil and from local usages are naturally very varied; but the common language is firmly grounded in every city and country district; and even in Louisiana and in California, where there are still French and Spanish speaking populations, their speech is gradually melting in the English crucible. Even the Germans, when they come in enormous numbers to new tracts, and form the overwhelming majority of the population, never succeed in imposing language or dialect. It is true that they make no efforts to do so, preferring rather to flow into the Anglo-Saxon mould; but efforts, were they made, would be worse than useless. Some twenty years ago the Germans resident in Saint Louis founded the "Germania Club," which has for its cardinal principle the non-admission of native Americans; but in less than three years there were two hundred American names upon its list of membership. Though the number of Germans in America is enormous, they have never been able to maintain more than one first-class German theatre—the theatre of Teutonic Opera in New York City. The comedy theatres in the Western cities for German-speaking populations are very far below the level of such institutions in the Fatherland, and one day will totally disappear. The reason for this is to be found in the fondness of the rising generation of German-Americans for a dramatic literature which savours of their surroundings, which speaks to them of their daily life and its joys and its sorrows, and not one which portrays a far distant social status and one entirely unsympathetic with democracy.

Despite all that has been done by a hurrying, greedy civilization, anxious for shelter and comfort of the best kind, but in no wise worried about exterior ornamentation, many American cities are

abundantly supplied with picturesque elements. Sometimes a noble occasion has been lost : as in San Francisco, where the palaces of the wealthy merchants and railway magnates are arranged along the sand-hills without any regard for the general effect. A little forethought and the employment of builders of artistic perception would have given San Francisco a grouping worthy of the best days of antique architecture. There is a grotesque pathos in the location of the principal cemeteries of the city, on the topmost of the dunes ; as if the dead and their final earthly home were to be set more directly in evidence than the palaces and the artistic achievements of the living. San Francisco is not favoured with such noble neighbours as her more northward sister, Portland, Oregon. Portland has, when the skies are propitious, an outlook over mountains which have no need to be envious of the Bernese Alps. There is nothing in Switzerland more nobly impressive than the beautiful and ethereal outline of Mount Haud, as seen through the forest and openings from the precipitous hills at the back of Portland. The chief city of Oregon is rather rectilinear, but looks very little like the typical Western town in other respects. Society is clannish, and shows the effect of its long isolation from the Eastern portion of the country, before railways came across the continent to it—in a certain shyness, not to say jealousy, with regard to strangers. It is wealthy, and its cultivated people are fond of good music and literature, although, perhaps to their shame be it said, the best theatre in the city is the Chinese one. The Chinese individual can scarcely be called picturesque ; but the exterior decoration of his shops and such dwellings as he erects is decidedly so. He puts a note of colour, if not of gaiety, into the rather sombre Western life. His meekness and almost invariable good humour are in strong contrast with the ferocity and brutal lack of politeness of underbred natives. His industry never fails ; the visitor, in his promenades in Portland, invariably finds stout, red-faced Irishmen sunning themselves at the doors of their grog-shops, but never is a Chinaman seen idling away the precious moments of his existence. The gravity—we had almost said stolidity—of the Chinamen at their theatres, in the presence of the representation of grand and thrilling episodes in their national history, is quite striking. The magnificence of these theatres is mainly in costume. The stuffs, the tapestries, the embroideries, the weapons, and banners, and insignia, which belong to the Chinese theatres of Portland and San Francisco are worth many hundreds of thousands of dollars, and are made in China expressly for these institutions. The managers must derive great profits from their business, for every night the theatres are crowded with solemn Chinamen in black trousers, blue blouses, felt slippers with enormously thick soles and square, turned-up toes, and with their heads covered with black American slouch hats, beneath which their “ pig-

tails " are carefully tucked away. There is no curtain to the stage ; entrances and exits are made by the same door ; a warrior dispenses with a horse, and simply simulates the action of mounting one ; he fights with invisible enemies, and continues chattering like a magpie without provoking either smile or tear from his audience. The Chinese tragedian despises such artifices as the actors of the Western world resort to ; the whole play upon the stage being the work of imagination, it is easy to imagine an army, a city, a horse, a band of robbers : one or two central figures are necessary to fix the attention. There are two methods of delivery, totally distinct : one colloquial, and seeming to have some human nature in it ; the other a kind of rant, generally inflicted upon the audience by a gorgeously dressed personage, who serves as chorus, or to point the moral ; the effect of his monosyllabic and rasping diction is both ludicrous and depressing. The rôles of women are invariably filled by men, who act with a certain grossness ; but there is rarely anything calculated to shock refinement or modesty shown at the Chinese theatres in the Western cities. The same praise cannot be accorded the native theatrical institutions. The " Varieties " theatre is a vile cancer, which is eating the life out of many a community in the United States, and nowhere, probably, is there a viler one than in Portland in Oregon. It is to be hoped that in time the municipality may provide for the native working classes within its limits entertainments as decent, sober, and honourable as those which the Chinese have provided for themselves. To this a Western critic will at once reply that the " Varieties " are visited only by the lower classes of Americans, and that the vice of these classes stops there ; whereas the Chinese—decent enough in public—are in private profoundly immoral, having, in fact, no sense of what morality is. We are convinced that this statement is exaggerated. The " Varieties " theatre—with its cheap debit of the corruptions of Europe and of the great cities of the American Atlantic coast—does reach and corrupt other than the lowest American classes. A theatre into which decent women will not go, but which their husbands and brothers think it no shame occasionally to frequent, is a public danger which cannot be too soon done away with.

Exteriorly the Chinese quarter in San Francisco is not at all picturesque ; but its subterranean burrows are quite as mysterious and startling as any in Venice or Constantinople. How these extraordinary dwellings beneath the streets were constructed is a source of wonder. There are cellars and sub-cellars, and yet cellars below these latter : shelves in dark recesses where whole families bestow themselves for the night—one family above another, like the dead in a Spanish cemetery ; Lilliputian rooms, where opium smokers lie coiled together ; and shaky wooden staircases, seemingly leading into bottomless pits, but presently conducting to some rookery

inhabited by half a hundred Chinamen, whose annual rental cannot be much more than fifty cents each ! In the wealthier sections of the quarter there are elegant tea-houses, where, at a moderate expense, one may taste tea more healthily exhilarating than the best Champagne wines ; and where one may now and then see a respectable merchant, clad in silks, lost in the opium trance. The temples are rarely impressive : they are merely small halls with tapers burning in them before the carved images of departed Chinese worthies—not deities, but good men canonized, as it were. The priests profess to believe in the miraculous powers of the images, but there is a comical twinkle in their almond eyes when they describe the pranks of the images to an Anglo-Saxon visitor.

Incomparable servants—these silent-footed, smooth-faced sons of the East—and destined to make their way into millions of households beyond the Rocky Mountains one day, when hostile legislation is at an end ; when, in short, the American workman has learned how to live economically, and is no longer afraid of being ruined by “Chinese cheap labour.”

The approaches to San Francisco by water are not especially impressive. After the immense and majestic stretches of the Pacific with its enormous swell, which tells of the thousands upon thousands of miles of unbroken water solitudes, the Golden Gate seems a trifle petty. This feeling is heightened if one arrives in the harbour when a quiet cool mist, sweeping in landward, wraps the sand-hills in a kind of ragged curtain, through which sections of bluffs crowned with crazy looking houses appear. But the interior of the town is not at all disappointing. San Francisco looks quite as old and substantial, in all its business quarters, as Liverpool or Hamburg ; there is nothing rickety or ungraceful in the appointments of hotel or shop ; but one thing lacking to characterize a great and wealthy city is the large number of handsome private equipages seen in European towns. The cable cars, crawling to and fro, without any visible motive force, seem weird and magical, especially as they climb terrace after terrace of the sand-hills and turn around corners as if they were endowed with life. Bits of South San Francisco, lying on the long sun-swept hill-sides, are quite enchanting, and there is a Spanish sense of grouping in them which leads one to believe that the predecessors of the American in California have left many of their descendants in that quarter of the town. The city has no public buildings worthy the name : the chief municipal structure is set in a sandy hollow, instead of upon one of the hills, and is irretrievably ugly within and without. Let us hope that some day a Californian millionaire may give the chief city of the Golden Coast a city hall which shall sum up in its architecture and statues the history of the marvellous State—her pioneers and her builders.

The men of the Pacific coast hold themselves in fair esteem ; they

are not averse to hearing the praises of their own exploits; yet they stand criticism well. Perhaps it is because they do not think that they need it. We have heard it said by a well-known clergyman of California: "There are in our State great numbers of second-rate men, who, because they came at a time when they had no competitors, and have had everything their own way, fancy themselves the possessors of genius." The real men of distinction in California are gentle in manner, soft in speech, quick in decision, sharp in quarrel, bold in struggle, and patient under defeat. Nearly every one has a vein of humour in his character, and adversity brings it out. San Francisco is a city where society is too constantly changing, because of the change in the controlling influences around it, to have any stable social type just yet. Each new trans-continental railway causes the reorganization of business in San Francisco, and it is but logical to suppose that society also undergoes a certain reorganization. But in the social atmosphere of San Francisco the cosmopolitan element is not perceptible. What is ordinarily understood by the word "cosmopolitanism" San Francisco does not possess; what it does possess, instead, one may call provincialism, if we use that term in its noblest and most complimentary sense. It is not metropolitan like New York, nor is it likely to be so for three or four generations. It has, however, a fine flavour of romance; nothing of the rawness and vulgarity of a very new city; and if "culture" does not run about the streets, as in Boston, it has many places of frequent resort, and many a magnificent donation is laid upon its shrine.

The intense rivalries between adjacent cities in the United States are nowhere else so well illustrated as in the cases of Saint Paul and Minneapolis, and Saint Louis and Chicago. The two cities last mentioned have incentives to jealousy which do not exist for the first two: Saint Louis is the chief city in an old slave-holding State, where aristocracy was proud, not to say arrogant, and where a strong sympathy with the great South was felt long after the Civil War—sympathy promoted and nourished by the material interests dependent on the giant waterways of the Mississippi. Chicago was the new metropolis of a staunchly loyal State, which held in detestation the very memory of the "Missouri Compromise," which cared little for aristocracy, and sneered at the conservatism of the old fogies of Saint Louis. Saint Paul and Minneapolis—both in the same phenomenal State of Minnesota, and separated only by fifteen miles of plain—remind the dispassionate observer of twin brothers, each of whom strives night and day to outdo the other in material and mental progress. In San Francisco the speculative and gambling element in business dominates everything else; manufactures are not boasted of; the talk is concerning mines good, and mines bad, and mines indifferent; of cargoes from the mysterious lands of Nippon and

Cathay ; of wheat from the new and far North West ; but in Minneapolis we are among the manufactures. There are great flour mills, such as are to be seen nowhere else in the world ; there the wood from the mighty forests is turned into furniture and timber for buildings and doors and window-sashes for European houses : the gambler in stocks is a second-rate personage. In Saint Paul are hundreds of workshops providing for the innumerable wants of the settlers in Dakota, and Montana, and Idaho, and Washington, and Oregon. These two communities, which scarcely existed fifty years ago, now have hundreds of thousands of inhabitants, many railways terminating in their midst, palatial hotels, and a large class of wealthy citizens. Saint Paul claims precedence in rank, because it fronts upon the "Father of Waters," and because its steamboats run to Saint Louis and carry merchandise and news to the teeming population along the banks ; but Minneapolis laughs this claim to scorn, and points to her numerous mills and timber yards as the sources of real greatness. These Minnesota people have the Eastern sharpness and the Yankee thrift ; the foreign element has brought a sturdiness which serves to steady things. Many a consumptive New England man, who was at the gates of death when he went to Minnesota, remained in the State to become rich and robust, and can laugh at the rigours of a winter climate which would frighten a Russian. Saint Paul has its "ice carnival," its "ice palaces," and games on the frozen rivers and lakes at the same time that the citizens of New Orleans, thousands of miles southward, are languidly celebrating their carnival among the roses and magnolias, the camellias, japonicas, and the jessamines. The merchant princes of Saint Paul and Minneapolis visit New Orleans in the winter, and the Louisiana planter flies from the prostrating summer of his native lowlands to the cool and perfumed uplands of Minnesota, the land of Hiawatha and Minnehaha and of Mondamin, the rustling maize. Saint Paul owes no allegiance to New York ; it considers itself a metropolis, gives the tone to manners and politics in the hundreds of new towns in the North-West, and believes that its own expansion is limitless. A journey through the West region opened to civilization by the Northern Pacific Railway, with its lines stretching far away to the superb arteries of Puget Sound, inclines one to share Saint Paul's abundant confidence. If Chicago's growth is marvellous, that of Saint Paul and Minneapolis is magical. To-day, they send their morning papers into peaceful homes, where, but a few years ago, the savage Sioux fought with success against the insufficient cavalry and infantry of the United States.

Neither Saint Louis nor Chicago are a full day's journey, in the rapid express trains of the present, from New York ; yet New York does not seem to influence either of them much. Saint Louis is original and independent even in its conservatism ; its face is turned

to the South-West ; it deals in iron, beer, cotton, and leather, and lead, and lumber, and grain ; the lead mining region tributary to it covers seven thousand square miles ; the vast valleys around the Iron Mountain are filled with blast furnaces which send their product to Saint Louis ; and Northern Texas and the Indian Territory furnish hundreds of thousands of bales of cotton. Saint Louis had 1000 inhabitants in 1788 ; in 1888, it certainly has 600,000. Fifteen years ago its growth was so rapid that its School Board was compelled to build seven or eight large new school buildings annually, each capable of containing eight hundred pupils. The progress in Saint Louis was greater in the ten years after the close of the Civil War than in the other ninety odd years of its existence. Chicago was started when Saint Louis began to boast of its growth ; the "infant phenomenon" had been wont to have everything its own way, and disliked a competition ; hence much of its humour and rather ponderous merry-making at the expense of the Missourians. Saint Louis is distinctly picturesque, animated, vivacious ; Chicago has vivacity, but is painfully ugly, even in its most majestic quarters. Chicago is rectilinear, like Berlin ; Saint Louis is irregular, graceful, and interesting, like Dresden or old Vienna. It has the river—the gigantic Mississippi, with its teeming fleets of steam-boats, and barges, and rafts, and its thousands of negro roustabouts, to give its fresh water port the animation of Genoa or Naples ; and it has, also, the flavour of "Wild West," which Chicago, if it ever had, has quite lost. Chicago is a New England city stopped by a vast lake while crossing a prairie, and fringed about with certain western additions. Its cheap quarters are filled with the scum of half a dozen Northern European capitals ; ill-born, ill-educated, lazy foreigners of the lowest class—mad with Socialism and muddled with drink. The foreign emigration to Saint Louis was of the better sort—German politicians, writers, musicians, and minor philosophers driven from their native land by the Revolution of 1848, who, if they have not contributed anything very remarkable to the literature of their adopted country, have made a certain impress for good upon the social life of Saint Louis. Chicago, undoubtedly, had the superior energy and enterprise in the days before the war ; to-day Saint Louis has little to envy her. Had Saint Louis been burned to the ground as Chicago was, her citizens would have rebuilt it from the ashes as cheerfully, and with as much courage, as was manifested by the men of the chief city of Illinois. Neither city has much literary status ; the schools and universities are abundant and richly endowed, but the mental activity does not get turned into literary channels. There is high refinement of thought in Chicago, but it does not get accurate expression outside one or two churches, professoriates, and newspapers. In both Saint Louis and Chicago the architecture is characterless and poor. Things are big ; but they

are not beautiful. Both cities have miles on miles of mansions, but none with original character. Nature has done much for the cities; the parks and gardens are enchanting; but in the main streets straggling processions of telegraph poles, and multicoloured signs, swinging high up above the roadways, mar the general effect. The slums—we will consider the slums of all the American cities in a separate section.

When Boston tightens its purse-strings, Chicago feels poor; but Saint Louis professes not to know where Boston is. Chicago harks back to the East; Saint Louis claims to hear the surf of the Mexican Gulf and the roar of the wind across the Sierra Madre. Chicago is speculative, like San Francisco—fond of “corners” and enormous operations which figure up millions; Saint Louis is ambitious, but dreads speculation. The Missouri capitalist says of a dangerous scheme, “Rash and rapid, like Chicago;” the Illinois adventurer says of a safe and steady enterprise, “Slow and stupid, like Saint Louis.”

The journey by steamboat from the Missourian metropolis to New Orleans, in the days when water transportation suffered no competition from the now omnipresent railways, occupied as much time as the voyage to-day from New York to Liverpool; yet despite the immense distance (twelve hundred miles of tortuous river channel) the two communities were in reasonably intimate communion. At present there is rivalry, and its accompanying passion jealousy, to make these relations less cordial than of old. New Orleans feels that she should handle the cotton and other products of the newly developed South-West, but St. Louis is not willing to admit any such claim. It has been said that both Norfolk, in Virginia, and St. Louis, in Missouri, draw away from the New Orleans market cotton grown within two hundred miles of the Louisiana capital. Such are the vexatious changes wrought by the mighty development of the railway system. But New Orleans has many compensations: the wheat from California, Washington, and Oregon is carried to her granaries over the Southern Pacific Railway and its tributaries. This union of San Francisco and New Orleans by a direct southern rail route is to have many surprising commercial results by-and-by.

The arrival at New Orleans by river on a lovely spring night, after an eight days' journey down the majestic stream from lands where winter is still enthroned, is a sensation never to be forgotten. The long lines of electric lights reflected in the vast volume of swiftly yet smoothly running water; the perfumes from the roses and jessamines in the thousands of gardens and plantations half hidden by the high *levees*; the quaint and spectral passage of the numerous white steamboats; the babble of French peasants and the shouting and singing of the irrepressible negroes; the mysterious

manner in which the whole great city seems to arise out of the bosom of the current—all these things produce a unique impression upon the stranger's mind. New Orleans is the chief of the Mississippi: the huge stream brings her her wealth from foreign lands—covers her plantations from time to time with fat alluvium, and, now and then, drowns them in chaotic ruin. On a Saturday evening, when dozens of three-storey steamboats are starting up river, saluting each other with their mellow whistles, rich and poor citizens crowd the *levees*. They recognize in these quaint monsters, with iron bellies and flaming nostrils, the source of the city's prosperity. On the *levees*, and west of Canal Street, everything is American in aspect; east of Canal Street you are in old provincial France, in some quiet quarter of Bordeaux, or Toulouse, or Périgueux. The architecture is half Spanish, half French; the *portes cochères*, the balconies, the roofs all speak of France and Spain; the shops are foreign in look, and so are the shopkeepers. The mingling of bloods and the sensuous climate have here contributed to give a voluptuous beauty, which, alas! fades early. French New Orleans seems to hold its own well: the clannish nation relinquishes as few of its habits as possible, and it may be blessed for having successfully exerted its influence on two important things in the city—good cookery and good taste in display. The markets are paragons of taste; the shop windows are poetic studies in arrangement. Exquisite greys and blues are to be seen on the walls, in the same effective contrast as in the skies of France. New Orleans is the city for night life. The warm and tranquil evenings, rich with the scent of flowers, are inexpressibly bewitching. The evening call is unconsciously prolonged until the smallest hours of the morning. Society is gay, genial, eminently hospitable, a trifle provincial; but the latter feeling is by no means so apparent as before the war. The Carnival festivities are far more elaborate and have more costly accessories than in Paris. Each year New Orleans, Memphis, and other of the great cotton cities give up business for a Carnival of unrestrained jollity. The "King of the Carnival" demands the keys of the city, and requires implicit obedience from all. A famous tragedian, playing an engagement in New Orleans, was informed by the King of the Carnival that on the first night of the saturnalia he must allow every one to enter his theatre without money and without price. He declined to obey, and presently found himself in gaol—the "king" having power over even the city police; nor was he released until he had made an ample apology. No Northern city could support a Carnival like that of Memphis and New Orleans. The soft Southern atmosphere, the serene skies, the warmth, and fairy moonlight, the flowers and the grace in attitude and costume found in the South, are necessary to this institution. Many of the so-called Carnival balls in New York are orgies such as New Orleans would not, for an instant, tolerate. The "upper

circles" in New York would not know how to amuse themselves in Carnival. They could not, or they would not, unbend sufficiently; nor would any one of their number die under the weight and heat of his disguise as did a member of the "Mystic Crew of Comus" in New Orleans some years ago, rather than break his oath by revealing his identity. Carnival can be celebrated only when *la tête est près du bonnet*, as in New Orleans. Yet the same city which produces so many frolicsome temperaments also numbers among its citizens some of the most rigorous Presbyterians in the United States, men and women who never enter a theatre or countenance any other form of worldly entertainment. These excellent people act, both in society and in politics, as balance wheels, a function, for that matter, thoroughly fulfilled by the orthodox in nearly every American city. In New Orleans the blood leaps in the veins, and there are still many disastrous feuds and private quarrels which, in other communities, would be settled in the courts, but which are submitted to the supreme arbitrament of the knife or the pistol. "I was somewhat alarmed when I received a message from a well-known politician that he would shoot me at sight," said a Northern man who had settled in New Orleans, "but I made up my mind that if I went to live in the city I could not dodge such things, and so I armed myself, and went into all the places where this person was likely to be found, determined to have the first shot." Nothing came of this sanguinary message on that occasion, but a few years afterwards the Northerner had killed his man in an encounter on a New Orleans side-walk, stabbing him with a common jack-knife! He was acquitted, although he had many political enemies.

In alluding to this delicate subject of "personal encounters" in the South, it is but fair to say that they are less numerous in city than in country. Undoubtedly, most of the deadly quarrels in the cities, especially those between gentlemen, are due to two exaggerations—exaggerated notions about personal honour, and an excessive use of alcoholic fluids. Jealousy seems rather more common in the South than in the North; and resentment appears more lasting. The quarrels are rarely with strangers; a transient guest may say whatever he likes to the citizen who would at once resent the same remarks if made by a resident.

New Orleans is the only really great city in the South—the only one likely to assume a metropolitan character by-and-by. But there are many smaller communities which are distinctly cities, and have city ways, opinions, and styles, and export them to their tributary districts. Some of these are directly influenced by the North: like Jacksonville in Florida, and Atlanta in Georgia; we had almost included Charleston—once the political antipodes, now the firm friend of the North, even of Boston. The cities of the South Atlantic seaboard have been more readily and directly influenced by what we may call

the new national spirit than cities like New Orleans, and Galveston, and Richmond. Charleston, without losing any of its old savour, has been modernized in thought, and reconciled completely with the Union and to the emancipation of the black serf. It keeps its quaint Old World look, and is the most original of Southern cities. There is a fascinating atmosphere of romance about its unpainted houses with their mysterious porticoes, half buried under the luxuriant foliage, and shaded by the moss-hung live oaks; but a walk along the busy avenues by the water side shows that Charleston is in constant and profitable communication with the great world out beyond, and that more than one earthquake is necessary to destroy the energy of its citizens. The current of foreign and Northern travel flows through Charleston and Savannah, and along the Floridian peninsula, to the lazy and entrancing nook christened after Saint Augustine—a paradise of orange orchards set beside a sapphire sea. This new Eden boasts at the present time, if we are credibly informed, “the finest hotel in the world”—a structure beside which the caravanserais of Northumberland Avenue sink into insignificance, at least in the Floridian imagination. Some day a stately Venice will grow up on the St. John’s in Florida; the banks of the noble river are already dotted here and there with splendid mansions, and a future century will give us the ideal silent city in this most beautiful of Southern resorts. No city of the extreme South has more romantic associations than Saint Augustine: its crumbling fortress, its seawall, its bits of Spanish architecture all endear it to the new nation which has so few antiquities that it positively adores those in its possession.

All those Southern cities—Savannah in the middle of its fat rice-fields and beside its meandering river; Charleston, on the sea; Galveston, stretching along the magnificent beach on the Gulf; Columbia, in the rich and cool uplands of South Carolina; Columbus, with its groups of prosperous cotton-mills; Macon and Augusta and Atlanta—have their questions of race division, colour line and caste—questions which, to a foreigner, seem of minor importance, but which are burning and all-important ones to the Southerner. The negro in the cities, having voices in the conduct of affairs, becomes policeman, sometimes magistrate—now and then higher official than the white man; but this result has not been reached without battle, and much animosity. In most of the Southern cities the negro’s gain in civilization is steady; if he does not gain in morality, it is not the fault of the whites, who do their best to interest him. The negro shows a disposition to be clannish, and there are those who believe that one day the race will migrate southward to Mexico. But this does not coincide with the opinion which we heard expressed by a full-blooded negro in a convention which was considering the delicate subject of a general emigration to

Liberia. "Others may go to Africa, if they desire to do so," said this sable orator; "as for myself, I am black, but I am an American. This is my country; I was born in it, and I propose to remain in it."

American cities, South and North, have one feature which is novel to the European, and which gives them an hospitable and confiding look. They are not filled with high walls, which jealously shut out fine mansions and gardens from the passer-by. There is no apprehension of the burglar, or of the neighbour, apparent in the millionaire's boundaries. Once, small fences or hedges were the fashion, but now, in many cities, the private grounds are open to the street. In St. Louis, in the warm evenings, society moves on to the front porch, and from eight to ten o'clock a gentleman may call on a dozen ladies without being invited into a single house. Even the courting is conducted, with such decorum as the situation requires, on the front door-steps. This custom prevails in numerous other Western and South-Western towns. To the Boston mind this is quite startling: it shocks him even more than to learn that, in St. Louis, the theatres are open, as in wicked Paris, on Sunday evenings. In all American cities there is far greater freedom of social intercourse than in European centres. A young American girl, transferred to some continental town, where there is no calling outside the circle of family relations, where there is no lecture course, no concert save that of the regimental band in the square, and no promenade save under the jealous scrutiny of a chaperone, would perish of *ennui*. At home she does not realize the extent of her freedom, and she could be brought to an adequate realization of its extent only by its temporary loss.

In another paper we may pass in review some of the characteristics of the great cities of the Middle West, and the grand procession of cities between Washington and Boston; and at the same time we may take occasion to examine certain questions of type, morality, culture, refinement, and its opposite—crime and its repression; industry and art, church and theatre, politics and play, in these numerous centres of the New World's activity.

THE CO-OPERATIVE CONGRESS.

THE twentieth Co-operative Congress, which met last month at Dewsbury, is worthy of notice on many grounds. The inaugural address was delivered by Mr. E. Vansittart Neale, a veteran co-operator, than whom no living man has rendered greater services to the movement, or made greater sacrifices for its advancement. He was one of the little band of Lincoln's Inn men that gathered round Frederick Dennison Maurice, and included Canon Kingsley, Thomas Hughes, and some others whose names are household words wherever social reformers are honoured. In 1849 he joined Maurice's society for promoting working men's associations. Bringing with him wealth, which he was willing to spend in the cause, energy, and an ardent temperament, he soon started several associations on a more ambitious scale than had been hitherto attempted. Most, if not all, of these failed more or less disastrously after a short career. Still Mr. Neale persisted. His time, his thoughts, and his purse were freely devoted to the cause which he had embraced—the elevation of the worker through the principles of co-operation. He established a “central agency” which anticipated the idea of the present “wholesale society.” It failed too. But Mr. Neale's failures were instructive, and they convinced many people of the great possibilities contained in the principle of associated action. He aided in establishing the yearly congresses in 1869, and in 1875 he undertook the heavy duties of general secretary to the central board, a post which he still holds. After the address, Mr. Thomas Hughes—equally beloved by co-operators and schoolboys—making a presentation to Mr. Neale, on behalf of the Hebden Bridge Society, reminded his fellow-delegates that Mr. Neale was the “owner of one of the most beautiful places on the banks of the Thames—in the very golden eye of England—Bisham Abbey. Mr. Neale might live there in the enjoyment of every luxury, of every delight which it is possible for man to enjoy. But where *does* Mr. Neale live? In lodgings in Manchester, which he (Mr. Hughes) had visited, and in which he was bound to say he would not care to spend his days.” To scorn delights and live laborious days in obscurity is admirable in the young and ambitious. In a man of seventy-eight, who seeks no personal reward, it is heroic.

Of Lord Ripon, who presided the second day, we need say little,

except to note that among his many genuine efforts to serve his generation, his steady, life-long support of co-operative principles is by no means the least.

Mr. Cave, the president of the third day, has made his mark inside the co-operative body as a practical worker. His industrial career began at the ripe age of eight!—as a half-time piecer. By his own efforts, taking advantage of the opportunities which Dewsbury happily offered to all, he acquired a good commercial education, which, combined with business aptitude and solid elements of character, has gradually raised him to the position of “trusted head of one of the largest and most flourishing co-operative societies in the kingdom, and the host, so to speak, of the members of the Congress of 1888.”

The inaugural address was admirable, and struck the key-note of the Congress’s proceedings—What is co-operation going to do for the elevation of the worker as such? As Mr. Holyoake dwelt last year with pardonable pride on the marvellous results that co-operation has achieved in various ways, so Mr. Neale dwells with enthusiasm on the marvels of social regeneration that co-operation has yet to realize. The present time is felt to be a crisis. There is a danger, the president said, lest the selfish devices of economy should get direction of the movement and damage its moral fibre. Equity was easily realized in the sphere of distribution. As the Yorkshireman said in the days when the co-operative idea was still new: “It war a wonderful time when a man could get rich just by eating and drinking.” But Equity had a much harder task before her when, quitting the easy-going car of distribution, she mounted that of production, where she found before her, in Self-interest, “a donkey that wouldn’t go.” This unhappy donkey got well walloped by Mr. Neale and other speakers. He put very strongly the argument against permitting the consumer to appropriate the whole of the profits, and had no difficulty in showing that co-operation could not sanction such a one-sided arrangement. He pleaded irresistibly for a federal union of producers and consumers through the wholesales, part profit and part management being conceded to the workers. Round the principles on which the president took his stand the din of battle raged for three days, amid many confusing and irrelevant cries; but in the end he had the satisfaction of seeing the majority of the combatants range themselves under his banner.

The special interest of the Dewsbury Congress lies in its formal adoption of the principle known as “profit-sharing.” They have recommended its application in all “productive” businesses carried on by co-operators. We confess we do not see why it should be confined to productive business. We should have thought it equally desirable in distributive. That, however, is a small point in practice, and the omission was probably due to oversight. The main point is that, by a considerable majority, the Congress has recommended that,

in all productive associations, "an alliance be formed on equitable conditions for the sharing of profits and risks between the worker, the capitalist, and the consumer." This is a victory of immense importance for the true idea of co-operation. That idea was, and is, that after full and fair payment to capital according to its risk, the profit remaining should be divided among all who have contributed to produce it, according to the money value of their services, instead of going, as it does in ordinary cases, wholly and exclusively to the employer. This principle has been reiterated under various forms again and again. Speakers and writers have taken it as their text, and dilated upon it as the guiding principle of the co-operative movement. The Co-operative Union of Great Britain states in its rules and orders, as one of its fundamental principles, that it aims at "conciliating the conflicting interests of the capitalist, the worker, and the purchaser, through an equitable division among them of the fund commonly known as profit." Yet, strange to say, the attempt to realize this aim has been again and again deferred, and up to the present moment hardly a pretence of sharing profits with the workers has been made.

The fact, of course, is, that the great mass of so-called co-operators are simply co-operative consumers, and do not pretend to be anything more: hard-working poor folk, who have clubbed their small means in order to get the necessaries of life cheaper and better, by doing for themselves honestly what they have hitherto paid the retail trader to do for them, which he has not always done honestly. The benefits they obtain as consumers are immediate and obvious. But it is not so easy for them to see, nor is it quite so certain, that they would get any immediate benefit by the sacrifice of a portion of their profit as consumers for the sake of a principle from which they are never likely to reap any personal benefit. Many of them, no doubt, neither understand nor care a fig for the principle. All they comprehend is that they are asked to give up what is legally theirs for the benefit of a group of men already as well off as themselves. To get them to understand the cause, to see its bearing on the future welfare of the class to which they belong, and to inspire them with some genuine enthusiasm for that cause is, after all, the only chance for productive co-operation and the social regeneration which it promises.

The practical importance of the resolution passed by the Congress will be seen if we bear in mind that the Co-operative Wholesale Society, generally for shortness called "the Wholesale," belongs to the 750 (or thereabouts) retail stores who send delegates to the Congress, so that the delegates are the elected representatives of the owners of the Wholesale. Whatever, therefore, the delegates in Congress decide is morally, though not legally, binding on the managers of the Wholesale.

Now, it happens, fortunately for the cause of progress, that the Wholesale is the proprietor of several producing establishments. It has a factory for boots and shoes at Leicester and another at Heckmondwike. It makes soap at Durham, and biscuits, sweets, &c., at Crumpsall. These factories are owned, and have hitherto been worked, by the Wholesale on precisely the same lines that joint-stock companies own and work their profit-grinding enterprises, except that, as the Wholesale manufactures only to supply its own members and not to sell to strangers in the general market, it is under no temptation to make bad articles or to gain profit unfairly. Most admirably has the Wholesale done its work—a perfectly legitimate work—for its owners; and as they are some 600,000 poor men and women, we are tempted to think that no words of acknowledgment can be too strong for the services it has rendered *distributive* co-operation. We acknowledge its beneficent action in that field of enterprise. But it has done nothing to elevate the position of the workers as such; and we would urge upon the 600,000 workers who own the Wholesale, that if it shrinks from the experiment of profit-sharing with their employés, they must look in vain for any other body to make it. Excepting, perhaps, the trades unions, who for some reason have hitherto been either indifferent or hostile to co-operation, there is no association of workers who are as deeply interested as they are in improving the status of workers, and in securing to them an equitable share of profits and a reasonable degree of independence, based on the possession of the means of setting themselves to work. Nor has any other body of workers equal advantages—a considerable capital, a market under its own control, organization, experience, and prestige.

We have often wondered why the trades unions do not start producing associations on co-operative principles. They have capital enough to make experiments, and they have in their organization and their knowledge of each other all that seems wanted to enable a number of highly-skilled workmen to work successfully in association. It is, therefore, a very encouraging and satisfactory sign that a new productive society, the Midland Tin-plate Workers, has been started by a trades union. This, as Mr. Hughes remarked, is a splendid advance on the fine words which alone have hitherto characterized the relations between trades unionists and co-operators.

One thing our English workmen lack; when compared with their brethren on the Continent—namely, the habit of submission to discipline and control. In modern industries which are so vast, so complex, so far beyond the mental comprehension of most of those concerned in carrying them on, discipline and ready obedience to authority are as necessary as they are in modern armies. So long as employers wield the power they have at present the necessary discipline is secured; but the moment this power is destroyed, and labour attempts to

organize itself on a democratic basis, the lack of discipline tells disastrously. Our national disposition and our unmilitary habits are unfavourable to these industrial virtues. The militarism of the chief Continental States is now, strangely enough, coming to the aid of their industrialism, while with us industrialism seems likely to suffer from lack of that discipline which militarism alone is capable of supplying at the present day. There can be little doubt that the greater success of co-operative production in France, as compared with England, is due very largely to the spirit of discipline and of obedience to orders which the military training of the whole manhood of the country has impressed on the workers. No other fact accounts for the contrast between our failure in co-operative manufacturing and our acknowledged supremacy in competitive manufacturing. In distribution we have not been similarly handicapped because discipline is hardly required, and so in this department our national superiority in trade has enabled us to go far ahead of our neighbours.

To understand the significance of the resolutions passed at Dewsbury, and the meaning of the discussions about them, we must bear in mind the position which co-operation, as a practical movement, has attained in England, what solid results it has achieved, and how far its methods are in harmony with the ideas of the founders of the movement. Probably, correct notions on these matters are much less common than is supposed. Co-operation is a term which covers many varieties of associated effort which have little in common. But for our purpose we need only consider the two main divisions, commonly known as distributive co-operation and productive co-operation; or, as they are sometimes called, co-operative trading and co-operative production.

We intend only to speak of working men's associations. The great London middle-class stores, the "Civil Service" and the "Army and Navy," we are not concerned with here, as their *raison d'être* is not to better the condition of the working classes, and they are not in the Co-operative Union. They have simply borrowed a good idea and worked it skilfully for their own benefit, in which there is nothing either specially praiseworthy or reprehensible. Most people are familiar with the distributive store or retail trading association. It can be formed by any number of people subscribing to purchase the goods they require direct from the wholesale merchant or manufacturer, instead of going singly for everything they need to the neighbouring retail shops. In this way they can dispense with the services of the retail trader or ordinary shopkeeper, and of course save for themselves the profit which has hitherto gone to the shopkeeper. The amount of that profit is found to be about £10,000 for every 4000 poor families. It seems, therefore, as Mr. Holyoake points out, that every 4000 poor families who patronize the small shops, pay the huge sum of £10,000 a year for having their goods

handed to them across the counter. The co-operative movement has made this quite unnecessary wherever there are enough people to set up a store. Moreover, co-operators not only get their commodities cheaper by this means, but they get rid of the danger of adulteration by the shopkeeper—a very considerable danger and a real grievance. A very short experience convinced most of these stores that it is best to charge their members the ordinary prices current in the neighbouring shops, and to divide periodically amongst the members whatever profit results. The members prefer this because they find it easier to save the profit when it comes in a good lump sum. All purchases are paid for at the time of making, so there is no running into debt on the part of the members, and there are no “bad debts” for the store to write off. The profits are divided amongst the members in proportion to the value of their purchases. In other words, they get back a discount or percentage on their purchases—the amount of the percentage depending of course on the amount of profit made by the store. It is found to range on an average from 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d. in the pound.

“A well-conducted retail store gives back to its members 2s. in the £ in dividends on their purchases, thereby proving that a man's wages are worth 10 per cent. more to him when they do not pass through the hands of the private retail shopkeeper; and if these dividends, instead of being withdrawn and spent, are left in the stores as loans or shares, they are increased by interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum. Now, rich men habitually pass by the retail shopkeepers for many of their large purchases, and so secure to themselves this saving of 10 per cent. on their outlay, whilst very poor men, who are not members of co-operative stores, often get into debt with a back-street huckster, who takes even more than the ordinary retailer's profit for his risk. The co-operative store, by abolishing the retail dealer, enables the poorest man to get as much for a shilling as the rich man does when he buys from a wholesale dealer, and it also delivers him from all fear of retail adulteration.”

Members must become shareholders to the extent generally of £1 at least. But in a society already established this is made easy for new members by allowing them to become members on paying a deposit of 1s., and crediting them with the dividends on their purchases until the dividends thus accumulated amount to the value of a share.

Any one can become a shareholder, and therefore the shares cannot rise above par. There are, at present, in the United Kingdom, about 1350 of these working-men's retail stores. Most of them have joined the Co-operative Union and send delegates to the annual Congress. The number of members of these stores is over 920,000. They are steadily increasing, and in two or three years will certainly exceed 1,000,000. They have a share capital of about £9,000,000, besides some millions on deposit. The amount of their sales to members was over £24,000,000 last year. The profits shared amongst members amounted to close on £3,000,000 sterling! Think of this; A revenue of £3,000,000 a year saved to working-men co-operators

without any sacrifice on their part—nay, with manifest benefits of other kinds, both material and moral, simply by improved organization.

Looking only at this financial result, what might not the working classes do for their class by a wise use of such a revenue! A portion of it they do, in fact, use right wisely and even nobly. Libraries, news-rooms, science classes, and University scholarships they have established. They subscribe to hospitals and various charities. They have placed public fountains in our streets and life-boats on our coasts.

But behind the retail stores, there is another development of distributive co-operation about which one hears less, and yet it is, in some respects, more important. We mean the two co-operative wholesale societies—one in England and one in Scotland. The establishment, by a federation of retail stores, of a great wholesale dépôt of their own, from which they could buy what they required, instead of going singly to the merchant or manufacturer, was partly forced on the stores by the tradesmen's threats of boycotting them. In some cases merchants and manufacturers did not dare to supply these stores for fear of losing their business with the neighbouring shopkeepers, who had threatened to withdraw their custom if the manufacturers and merchants supplied the stores. This was a serious danger, which at one time looked very likely to crush the struggling "co-ops." Fortunately, a way of escape was soon found, and in the result the merchants and manufacturers lost much of the custom of the stores, for which they are now ready to beg, cap in hand, while the enmity of the petty trader is rendered powerless. What more natural than for the separate stores throughout the country to combine for the purchase or importation of their supplies direct from the producer, and thus save for themselves the merchant's profit, just as the scattered individuals in villages had already combined to purchase their supplies direct from the merchant, thus saving the shopkeeper's profit. The happy idea was at once acted on, and in 1864 the English Co-operative Wholesale commenced business, doing a trade of £88,000 in that year. The latest returns show that its sales for last year were not far off £6,000,000 sterling. Its trading capital is over £880,000. It owns four valuable steamships of 500 tons each, which carry British produce to France and Germany and bring back French and German produce for the consumption of the members of the English retail stores. It has a number of purchasing dépôts in Ireland, in America, and on the Continent, for the purchase of provisions. We should have explained that the Wholesale is a trading partnership, the members being not individuals but co-operative societies. Only 877 out of the whole number of English stores belong to it, or rather it belongs to the 877 stores; but all others can become members by complying with the conditions, which are not numerous. A store, to become a member of the Wholesale, must take a certain number of its £5 shares, proportioned to the number

of individual members of the store in question. Thus every member of a retail store which is in partnership with the Wholesale is really a part proprietor of that great institution, and has, through his delegate, a voice in its management. As the Wholesale sells only to its own members, who represent nearly 700,000 co-operators, it has no inducement to make profit out of them or to give them bad articles, so that its members have their six millions' worth of goods handed to them at manufacturers' or importers' prices with no deduction beyond bare working expenses.

The immediate object of distributive co-operation is to dispense with all *unnecessary* profit-absorbing agents who intervene between the consumers of commodities and their producers, playing the part of parasites. By getting rid of these the cost of living is reduced, and at the same time temptations to adulteration and cheating are removed. The poor man, because he buys in small quantities, is the special victim of these uneconomic arrangements. He actually gets appreciably less for his shilling than the rich man gets for his, the reason being that the commodities bought by the poor man have passed through a greater number of profit-abstracting hands. We have shown how distributive co-operation has got rid of two sets of these agents—the retail shopman and the wholesale merchant—with great benefit to poor consumers. A still further saving is effected, and further purity of commodity secured, if the manufacturer can be dispensed with as well as the merchant and the shopkeeper. This is what the Wholesale Society is now gradually accomplishing. It already has its manufactures of boots and shoes, soap, biscuits, sweets, preserves, &c., and every member of a store that is in partnership with the Wholesale may, in a trading sense, consider himself a manufacturer of all these things.

We have not space to tell of half the wonderful achievements of co-operation, its palatial warehouses in various great cities, its streets of dwellings, its bank, handling £16,000,000 or £17,000,000 a year, its shares in great enterprises like the Manchester Canal, its newspapers, its lecture-halls.

In 1864, Mr. Gladstone, speaking in Parliament on the co-operative movement, declared that ten years before, "if I had been told that labouring men would so associate together for their mutual advantage I should have regarded the prediction as absurd." But look what strides have been made, since Mr. Gladstone spoke thus admiringly. He spoke of 130,000 co-operators: they are now nearly 1,000,000. He was thinking of a trade of £3,000,000: it has grown to over £80,000,000. He rejoiced that a body of working men could save £800,000 on their yearly consumption: they saved £3,000,000 last year.

No one will now deny that co-operation, in its distributive department at all events, is a great social and industrial fact: a splendid

triumph for the principles of mutual confidence and combination for collective purposes.

For a fuller account of the Wholesale and its constitution we refer the inquirer to Messrs Acland and Jones' *Working-men Co-operators* (Cassell & Co.), or to an admirable little pamphlet which we have freely drawn on entitled *The Co-operative Wholesale Society: What is It?* (Co-operative Printing Society, Manchester). We will conclude our brief account of distributive co-operation with the following excerpt from this little pamphlet:—

"We have shown that the retail and wholesale stores together save about 11½ per cent. for consumers. There are five millions of families of working people in Great Britain and Ireland receiving amongst them some four hundred millions sterling per annum. Now, if all except what is necessary for payment of rent and taxes was spent at the store, and by the store at the Co-operative Wholesale, 10 per cent. saving thereon would amount in twenty years to over SIX HUNDRED MILLIONS STERLING, which sum would be sufficient to make them all their own employers.

"Is not co-operation well worthy of the support of working men?"

This brings us to the heart of the matter. The founders of the co-operative movement in England, as well as in France, were social reformers, and aimed at far more than enabling the working-man to spend his shilling to the best advantage. Their aim was to emancipate the labourer from dependence on his capitalist employer. The only way they saw by which this emancipation could be effected was that the workman should, by some means or other, obtain the control of the capital which was necessary to keep him employed. In other words, he must become his own employer. Only in this way could he avoid the iron law which decrees that he shall never permanently get more for his services, however valuable they may be, than a bare subsistence wage, while even that is fearfully precarious. But how to get hold of this necessary capital? Socialists demanded that the State should lend or give it. This way of solving the difficulty did not recommend itself to any considerable number of Englishmen, either workers or thinkers. They had more confidence in some form of self-help.

Various experiments were tried, and noble efforts were made, to start associations of workmen more or less their own masters. These efforts have gone on to the present day with varying fortunes, but giving ever more and more promise of ultimate success. It soon became evident that only by accumulating the savings arising from co-operative trading was there much hope of the working-men co-operators forming a fund with which to set up productive associations. This was the idea of the Rochdale Pioneers, and it has since been acted upon in quite a considerable number of cases; but, unfortunately, it has in most cases been done solely in the interest of the stores by whom the capital was supplied, while the interest of the worker employed was not at all

considered, thus quite ignoring the equitable principle on which the social reformers based their faith in co-operation.

To make this clear, let us consider an actual case. The Wholesale Society has, as we said, a factory for the making of boots and shoes at Leicester, but its employes there—the working-men who actually make the boots and shoes—are hired exactly as they might be by Messrs. Rabbits or Mr. William Whiteley. They have no share in the capital of the concern, nor any voice in its management. The Wholesale is as completely and despotically their master—a very good one no doubt—as any private manufacturer could be. Nor have they any more interest in the success of their concern than Mr. Whiteley's employes have in his success. They get no share of profits, however largely they may have contributed to make them. The profits go to the Wholesale, and by it are distributed throughout the 650,000 members of the stores to whom the Wholesale belongs. As Mr. Holyoake strikingly put it in his speech at Dewsbury—

“In 1886 the Wholesale workshops made £9500 of profit, which amounted to £9 10s. per workman, there being 996 of them. Instead of giving it to labour, which earned it, they gave it to 970 stores. These, in their turn, dare not keep it, but had to give it to 650,000 members, who received one farthing and a half each. Thus 650,000 co-operators, with honesty in their hearts and equity on their tongues, were induced to deprive 996 workmen of £9 10s. each for the pitiful bribe of a farthing and a half.”

This way of looking at the facts is hardly fair to the 650,000 co-operators; for unless Mr. Holyoake thinks they are bound in equity to give up the whole of the profits which their capital has at least contributed to make, he will be obliged to approve next year of depriving the 996 workmen of *some* portion of their profit (say one-half, *i.e.*, £4 15s. each) for the pitifuller bribe of three-quarters of a farthing to each of the 650,000. The number of the claimants for a given sum is no reason why it should not be given to them. Moreover, the workshops are in their infancy, but when they grow to manhood the profits may be quite respectable, even if divided among six or seven hundred thousand poor people.

The only real question is—are the claimants entitled to this sum? They have, of course, the same title, both legal and moral, that the shareholders in any common joint-stock business have to the profits of their business, and as they are mostly hard-working poor folk, who feel very keenly the natural impulse to do the best they can for themselves and their children with the little savings which they have been taught to look on as absolutely their own, we cannot but think Mr. Holyoake chides them somewhat harshly. Probably, however, Mr. Holyoake meant no more than that capital should not have got *all* the profit, to the complete exclusion of labour; and in this we agree with him. We also entirely agree with him in this, that without some sacrifice, or what looks like a sacrifice, of their

individual interests, co-operators will do little to advance the emancipation of labour, very little towards realizing the beautiful vision of the labourer his own employer, very little towards redeeming their pledge to "conciliate the conflicting interest of the capitalist, the worker, and the purchaser through an equitable division among them of the fund commonly known as profit." This is the high ideal which all the founders and promoters of co-operation outside the ranks of the working-men, as well as many of the most enlightened and disinterested of the working-men themselves, have always kept before them and endeavoured to induce all co-operators to adopt. The question is what kind and degree of sacrifice, or apparent sacrifice, are co-operators to be asked to make for the sake of the cause. This is the question which in one form or another has been long and hotly discussed in all co-operative circles.

It is an error to imagine the ideal form of co-operative production to be that in which each group of workers owns and manages the business in which the group is employed, and is independent of all the world outside. According to this notion the Wholesale, if its members were absolutely uninfluenced by self-interest, and were thinking only of the cause of labour, would aim at establishing such independent associations of workers. This could be done no doubt in the case of every successful association by the simple process of dividing the profits amongst its working members, provided that instead of paying out these profits in cash the amounts were credited to the account of the members. The profits thus accumulated would, in a long or short time, according to the success of the business, be sufficient to pay off the original capital advanced by the Wholesale when starting the association. As soon as this was done the workers would be their own masters, working on a capital fairly earned, according to this theory, by themselves. One after another similar independent associations might be launched. The superior economy with which they could be managed, the greater interest and intelligence their workers would throw into their daily task, and the lower profits with which they might well be content, would give them an advantage over the old-fashioned capitalist establishments, sufficient perhaps to compensate for the loss of energy, enterprise, and rapidity of decision under collective as compared with individual management.

But such an association, having no co-operative relations with any group outside its own narrow limits, would be a purely competitive profit-making institution, and would infallibly degenerate before long into an association of capitalist shareholders, exploiting their wage-paid labourers. And what advantage would the members of the Wholesale receive for the surrender of a successful factory set up by themselves with their capital, at their risk, to supply their own wants? Over and above the satisfaction of believing they had advanced the cause of labour, there is no very obvious advantage,

Certainly there is no pecuniary advantage adequate to their pecuniary sacrifice.

We must, therefore, dismiss the idea of founding independent associations of workers with the funds of the general body of retail co-operators.

But, if we must not aim at making the workshops independent of the Wholesale, we can, at least, apply the well-tried principle of profit-sharing. Instead of all the profits, however large, going to the owners of the capital, a portion can be made over to the workers, after fairly remunerating the owners of the capital. The true principle appears to us to be that, as the labourer receives a fixed minimum reward for his services, in the shape of a daily or weekly wage, so capital should receive a fixed minimum reward for its services, in the shape of some specified rate of interest, say 5 per cent. But no profit is possible unless the goods are ultimately purchased. The price paid by the consumer is, therefore, an important factor in the final profit. He ought, therefore, to be considered in the division of profit. Whatever net profits remain, after payment of minimum wages and minimum interest, should be divided between the workers, the owners of the capital, and the purchasers of the produce, not necessarily equally, but according to some just rule, taking account of the various degrees in which labour and capital and consumption have contributed to the result, the risks to which the capital is exposed, and so on.

Now this is what co-operators have at last decided to do ; and it is this decision which will make the Dewsbury Congress memorable in co-operative annals. The Congress has no legislative power, but its moral influence is immense, and its members represent the separate societies and may be presumed to speak the wishes and sentiments of these societies. We have, therefore, good reason to expect that the resolution, which was carried by 213 to 160 of the delegates present, will be acted upon by at least as large a proportion of the societies.

The final resolution was as follows :—

“ That this Congress recommends that by whomsoever productive enterprises are established, whether by wholesale or distributive societies, or by organizations of workpeople themselves, an alliance be formed on equitable conditions of profits and risks between the worker, the capitalist, and the consumer ; and that this Congress invites the wholesale societies of England and Scotland, and all distributive societies who carry on production on their own account, to adopt, in the conduct of their works, the principle formulated above, and to assist the United Board by suggesting plans for perfecting it.”

It will be seen that the Congress has only adopted the broad principle that worker, capitalist, and consumer are each entitled to some share of the profit. What share must be fixed by a separate rule in each case. It will be noted also that the Congress has not

pronounced any judgment on the hotly disputed issues between the "federalists" and the "individualists" as to whether the wholesales or the smaller societies can best undertake the starting of such productive societies. These questions are apparently not yet ripe for settlement. The wholesale must prove its fitness to be entrusted with this all-important function. We do not doubt that it will succeed.

As the newspaper accounts of what took place at the Congress were singularly confusing and inaccurate, it may be worth while to give the following excerpt from a letter in which Mr. Holyoake explained the matter to the *Spectator*:—

"Two sets of resolutions were brought forward. One, by the adversaries of profit sharing with workmen, which, however, declared that labour should participate in profits 'whenever they can be divided with equity,' but prescribed no conditions ensuring its being done.

"The other set of resolutions declared in favour of profit-sharing with labour, and proposed that 'productive works should be carried on by distinct registered societies,' which vest the management in the members, and prescribes the 'allotment of profits in transferable shares with a federal union of all productive societies.' These resolutions bore the names of the President, Mr. Vansittart Neale, and four ex Presidents, Thomas Hughes, Lord Ripon, Sedley Taylor, and myself. It was evident from the temper of the Congress that this series of resolutions could be carried. As co-operators prefer to proceed by common consent, as most conducive to unity and good feeling, a substitute resolution was proposed by me, which affirmed the principle of 'profit-sharing with labour, custom, and capital,' and referred the question to the United Board in connection with the Wholesale Society, 'to report to the next Congress the best plan for giving effect to the principles.' This resolution had the advantage of being assented to by both sides, which would ensure its being carried out, as Congress has no executive authority over the Wholesale Society, it being an independent association. Congress has only a moral authority in these cases. This resolution was carried with acclamation. Then a further motion was made, enlarging the scope of my motion, by recommending an alliance between all productive societies, on the principle of 'sharing profits and risks between the worker, the capitalist, and the consumer.' This was put by the chair as an 'amendment;' but it might have been put as an instruction to the Executive charged with the duty of carrying out the preceding resolution. Mr. Swallow, who moved it, and his immediate supporters, intended going further than the motion carried. I voted for this instruction also, as did Mr. Greening, a strenuous advocate of profit-sharing, and nearly all those who had voted for the previous motion, so that it was carried by a larger number than before, the main resolution being supported by 160 votes, and this enlargement of its scope by 213, none, so far as I observed, voting against it. Thus the unanimity of the Congress was expressed in favour of fully carrying out the principle for which Mr. Neale, Mr. Hughes, Lord Ripon, Mr. Greening, Mr. Taylor, and myself contended. This would have been done years ago had co operators understood the case."

For the sake of brevity and clearness of illustration we have almost confined our mention of productive societies to those that belong to the Wholesale, and are in fact departments of that Society. • But there is a great variety of constitutions amongst the productive

societies calling themselves co-operative. Mr. J. C. Gray, in a very suggestive paper read before the Plymouth Congress in 1886, gives the following classification :—

1. Societies working on a system similar to the joint-stock companies, being owned by society and individual capitalists, and dividing all the profits on capital.
2. Societies on the federal principle, carried on by societies as collective capitalists, and dividing all profits between capital and purchasers.
3. Societies, such as corn mills, &c., working under a mixed proprietorship of societies and individuals, paying a fixed interest to capital, and dividing all profits amongst their customers.
4. Societies having a mixed proprietorship of societies, individuals, and workers, dividing profits between capital, purchase, and labour.
5. Societies carried on by workers only, sometimes with borrowed capital, paying a fixed interest on the capital, and dividing the remainder of the profits on labour only.

Only the Societies in groups four and five, it will be seen, give any direct benefit to their workers. They alone, therefore, are true to the highest aims of co-operation. Their numbers are few as yet; but we may expect they will increase in the future, since Congress has pronounced in favour of them. The constitution of group four is the only one that presents any difficulty. One or two examples will illustrate the principle.

The Paisley Co-operative Manufacturing Society, for instance, has 305 members, 120 of these being distributive stores, the remainder workpeople and other individuals. It divides its profits between shareholders, workers, and customers. At a recent division capital got 11½d. per £ for the half year; workers and customers got 11d. per £ on their respective wages and purchases during the same period.

One of the most encouraging instances is the Hebden Bridge Fustian Manufacturing Co-operation Society, of which we take the following account from Mr. Gray's pamphlet :—

"The Hebden Bridge Fustian Manufacturing Co-operation Society came into existence in 1870. It commenced by the payment of weekly subscriptions of 3d. each amongst a few fustian-cutters, who hoped by this means to provide something in the shape of a mutual benefit fund, upon which they might draw in case of need. Their attention was, however, directed to association as a means of self-employment, and they formed themselves into a society for the manufacture of fustian cloth in the latter part of 1870. At first they confined their operations to fustian-cutting, which was done in the homes of the workmen after their ordinary day's work was over, and the sums so earned were credited to the workers in the books of the society as share capital. Thus, without leaving their previous employment, they were enabled gradually to work themselves into capitalists on a small scale, and were by slow degrees building up a society destined in after years to find employment for all its members, if they so desired. The pieces of fustian so cut were sent out to be dyed and finished, and then sold to co-operative stores and others. The next step was to take a room and commence to make up the pieces, when finished, into clothing, thus finding employment for more workpeople. This was continued until the

year 1874, when a department for dyeing and finishing was added, a factory and estate costing £7000 being purchased for this purpose. During all this period the sales to co-operative societies were steadily increasing, and the demands upon the resources of the society became greater, until in the present year (1886) it commenced to weave its own cloth, and is thus in a position to take the cotton from the spinner and deliver it to its customers made up into clothing ready for wear. Commencing in 1870 with no regular workers, but simply employing its members in their leisure time at home, this society now has 200 workpeople in its employ, *and these workpeople are all shareholders to a greater or less extent.* It commenced with a trade of £32 for its first half-year. Now it is approaching a turnover of £30,000 per annum. The profits realized from the first half-year were £3; this last year they amounted to £2500. Its share capital now amounts to £17,857, of which £8059 is owned by 168 co-operative distributive societies, £2398 *by the workpeople*, and £7400 by other individuals. Three-fourths of its trade is done with co-operative stores. Of the profits, capital receives at the rate of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum, with the exception of a new issue of shares just commenced, which receive only 5 per cent. The remainder is divided at an equal rate per £ upon the wages earned by the workpeople and the amount expended by the purchasers respectively. During the transactions of thirty half-years it has only failed on six occasions to pay a dividend to workers and customers. The portion of profit falling to each worker is credited to his account as share capital until he has at least £20 paid up in the society. This course has the effect of giving each of the workpeople a thorough interest in the welfare of the society; greater care and economy is exercised in all departments of labour; and each one puts forth every endeavour to do his share towards making the business profitable, knowing that in proportion to the results so will his share of profits be."

Many other instances might be given to show that co-operative production can succeed, and is gradually finding out how to do so—finding out by the only conclusive method, actual experiment. •

The chief interest and importance of the co-operative movement lies, as we have said, in the prospect it holds out of making the workers independent of capitalists—not, of course, of capital. There is a weak point in *mere distributive* co-operation which Lassalle pointed out. Anything which enables working-men to make their wages go further, so that they enjoy a larger real reward, leads, *as soon as it becomes general*, to a corresponding fall in money wages. There may be counteracting causes, the most effective of which is, probably, the adoption of a higher standard of living by the wage-earners. But the danger is a real one, and if working-men co-operators desire to avoid, or at least to minimize it, they will aim at making themselves independent of capitalists. The first condition of effecting this is, that working-men shall find their own capital, and so become their own employers. Distributive co-operation, with its *three millions of surplus capital*, has shown them how to solve this part of the difficulty. But they must also find their own market. That is their weak point, and it is there the capitalists will attack them. The vast wealth, and the power of combination possessed by capitalists, would enable them to trade at a loss for an indefinite

time, and to offer at less than cost price the commodities made by co-operators, and for which co-operators must get a fair price or starve. Thus they could drive co-operators out of every market in which purchasers consulted only their own immediate individual advantage—that is to say, out of all ordinary markets. This they would undoubtedly do, if once alarmed. The only hope for the working-men's associations in that case is, that their fellow working-men will stand by them, and say they will buy working-men's goods at a fair price rather than the capitalist's goods at a temporary reduction. The temptation to poor women to buy the capitalist's wares, when he offers them at 20, 30, or perhaps 50 per cent. less than the stores can supply them, will be sore. Yet, if they can be made to understand their true and permanent interests, and to see the necessity of closing their ranks and standing shoulder to shoulder to resist the tempter, and refuse to betray their working brethren, they will sacrifice nothing to which they have a legitimate claim, and will in the end secure the elevation, materially and morally, of their own class.

Nor is the success of these working-men's associations a matter which concerns the working-classes only. Even capitalist employers may well wish them moderate and gradual success, lest a worse thing befall themselves. Socialism has made and is making great strides. Its motive-power is the very self-same grievance which co-operators are trying to remove. But its aims are more ambitious and its methods are violent and revolutionary. Co-operative production, if it succeeds and becomes general, will remove gradually and peacefully the grievance on which all that is morally strongest in Socialism is based. Co-operation in all its branches is winning for the poor all that is best in Socialism, without presenting one single ugly feature to alarm society as at present constituted. Socialism hates capitalists : co-operation aims at multiplying them ; and if it hopes to reduce the rewards of employers and their power over the destinies of working-men, it will also give improved security for capital. Socialism would confiscate private capital : co-operation hires it and pays liberally for its use. Whatever may be thought of Socialism, assuredly co-operation deserves the encouraging words of the Bishop of Bedford : " A blessed and a Christian work, and it shall have its reward."

MENTAL DETERIORATION: SOME OF ITS AVOIDABLE CAUSES.

THE causes of mental deterioration which we intend to discuss in this article are as follows—viz., (1) the habit of drinking alcoholic fluids; (2) the habit of smoking tobacco; (3) the habit of smoking opium; (4) the habit of taking morphia; (5) excessive mental work, and (6) insufficient sleep.

There are valid reasons for believing that many persons derive benefit from the use of small quantities of alcohol—persons who have become enfeebled by one cause or another; and, in proportion to the total population, such enfeebled persons are most numerous in cities. Jewellers in large towns are more prone to overwork themselves; and one of the common results of doing so is impairment of appetite and digestive power. Alcohol, taken very moderately, increases the secretion of gastric juice, and thus, by facilitating digestion, improves the general health and vigour. That the advantage gained in these cases has to be paid for we do not doubt; but careful attention to the question justifies the opinion that the sufferers in question are wise in paying the price exacted, and that, on the whole, they profit by doing so. Again, persons who are suddenly shocked, or become temporarily depressed by bad news or other causes, may derive immediate benefit from alcohol in some shape. In such cases it undoubtedly exerts a great power in steadying and, temporarily, in strengthening the nervous system. Moreover, in the treatment of various diseases, physicians often find, as they believe, that alcohol proves signally useful; but the fact that it does so is not a reason why it should be used habitually by healthy persons. Because quinine, opium, and chloral are potent medicines, they are not necessarily beneficent agents for daily use.

In our opinion, the proofs are abundant and decisive, that healthy men and women are most likely to preserve their health by abstaining from the use of alcohol altogether, and that they can do more, and more continuous work, without alcohol than with it. "Varied, repeated, and prolonged experience, and the testimony of army medical men prove that troops endure fatigue and the extremes of climate better if alcohol is altogether abstained from. The experience of the celebrated Moscow campaign showed this; so also, quite

Mental Deterioration.

recently, the Red River Expedition. During arduous marches always been found that, without alcohol, the health of the men is exceptionally good; but, as soon as spirits are allowed, disease breaks out. Modern trainers recognize the fact that the power of sustained exertion and resistance to fatigue is best promoted by abstaining from alcohol." It is well known that during the several expeditions towards the North Pole, those men who abstained from alcohol bore the extreme cold with less suffering or inconvenience than was experienced by those who took it.

But the question what are the effects of alcohol on the animal system demands our attention here only in so far as the brain is concerned; still, what is known of those effects on the constituents of the animal organism generally affords us valuable assistance in our endeavours to understand what is the nature of the influence exerted by alcohol on the brain, and, therefore, on its functions. "When alcohol is mingled with fresh arterial blood it darkens its colour, so as to give it more or less of the venous aspect;" in cases of fatal poisoning by alcohol, even the blood in the left cavities of the heart, and in the systemic arteries, which, normally, is of a bright red colour, is of a dark or venous hue. These facts justify the conclusion that when alcoholic beverages are taken the alcohol they contain interferes with, or impedes, the normal process of oxidation of the blood, and thus lessen the vitality of the whole organism to a degree corresponding to the amount of alcohol taken. Another injurious influence of alcohol on the blood may be correctly inferred from the well-known fact that alcohol has the power of coagulating soluble albumen; "and, although it is rarely, if ever, introduced into the serous fluids of the tissues by any ordinary alcoholic potations, in a sufficiently concentrated state to effect this, yet its presence, even in a very dilute form, *must* affect the chemical relations of albumen, and can scarcely do otherwise than retard that peculiar transformation by which it is converted into the more vitalized substance—fibrine." Moreover, the quality and function of this element of the blood is known to become impaired by the injection of alcohol into the blood-vessels.

If alcohol in a *very dilute* state be applied to the web of a frog's foot, the first effect of the application, observable by means of the microscope, is a quickening of the movement of the blood through the vessels, which are at the same time rather contracted than dilated; after a time, varying according to the degree of dilution of the alcohol used, the circulation becomes retarded, and the vessels become dilated; and then, after a further lapse of time, they resume their normal condition. If, however, the alcohol when first applied be in a less dilute form, the movement of the blood is not quickened, immediately retarded, and the vessels are considerably dilated.

The retardation in some parts may amount to complete stagnation; and in these the red corpuscles become crowded together, their normal form being lost, and their colouring matter being diffused through the *liquor sanguinis* or fluid part of the blood.

An especially notable effect produced by alcohol when in contact with soft animal tissues is that of corrugation. This effect is due to a difference of degree of the force of capillary attraction exerted by the tissues for alcohol and for water respectively. This corrugating effect of alcohol is usually increased by its coagulating influence on whatever soluble albumen the tissues may contain; and, of course, the conjoint effects in question producible in living tissue by alcohol will be proportionate to the degree of its concentration. This action of alcohol on the different soft tissues of the body seems to be exerted in a maximum degree on *nervous* tissue: the experiments of Dr. Percy have demonstrated that alcohol existed, in the brains of the dogs poisoned by it, in considerably greater proportion than in an equivalent quantity of the blood of the poisoned animals. It appears, therefore, that alcohol is specially drawn out of the sanguineous current by the nervous structures, and incorporated with their substance to such an extent as even to modify its physical, as well as its chemical, properties. Owing to the existence of this remarkable affinity, the continuous presence of a very small quantity of alcohol in the blood must inevitably exert a more injurious influence on the nutrition of the nervous substance than on that of any other animal tissue; for the alcohol is drawn to, and unites itself with, the nervous matter, just as other poisons, the effects of which are more sensibly manifest than are those of alcohol when taken in only small quantities, become attracted by, and localize themselves in, particular organs, or even in particular parts of one and the same organ.

During the process of complete intoxication alcohol seems first to attack the cerebrum; then the sensory ganglia, which it surmounts; and lastly, the medulla oblongata, together with the spinal cord itself.¹ In such a case, in which, as remarked by Dr. Maudsley,

"Each phase of an artificially produced insanity is successively passed through in a brief space of time, we have the abstract and brief chronicle of insanity. The first effect of alcohol is to produce an agreeable excitement, a lively flow of ideas, and a general activity of mind—a condition not unlike that which sometimes precedes an attack of mania;² then there follows, as in insanity, the automatic excitation of ideas which start up and follow one another without order, so that more or less incoherence of thought and speech is exhibited, while, at the same time, passion is easily excited, which takes different forms, according to the individual temperament; after this stage has lasted for a time, in some longer, in others shorter, it passes into one of depression and maudlin melancholy, as convulsion passes into paralysis;

¹ *On the Use and Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors, in Health and Disease.* By W. B. Carpenter, M.D., F.R.S., &c. Second edition, pp. 1-20.

² This is not always the case: in some cases, in which alcohol is taken, in even moderate quantities, its very first effects are mental dulness—approaching to partial stupor, and a certain amount of deafness.

the last scene of all being one of dementia and stupor. The different stages of mental disorder are compressed into a short period of time, because the action of the poison is quick and transitory; we have only to spread the action of the poison over years, as the regular drunkard does, and we may get a chronic and enduring insanity in which the scenes above described are more slowly acted."¹

The successive and increasingly grave consequences just indicated, of sudden intoxication of different degrees of intensity, are impressive manifestations of the powerfully poisonous influence of alcohol on the nervous system when the poison is taken in large doses; and, at the same time, they intimate, not less distinctly, that if it be taken *habitually*, even in comparatively very small doses, it can scarcely fail, in the long run, to impair in a perceptible degree the delicate structure and supremely important functions of the brain. Besides "transitory mania," which may be directly induced by alcohol, and delirium tremens, a notorious consequence of its excessive use, it is one of the most potent factors in the production of many other forms of insanity. During the last forty years the number of the insane in England and Wales has been duly registered, and, according to the evidence of official statistics, the increase of insanity within that period has been astonishingly great.

The following tables exhibit the evidence and the amount of that increase :—

Table showing the total number of Lunatics and Idiots in England and Wales on January 1, 1859, and subsequent years, and the rates of increase allowing for population.

Years.	Total number of lunatics, &c., on January 1.	Proportion to 10,000 of the estimated population.	Proportion to 10,000 of the population in various groups of years.
1859	36,782	18 674	19·171
1860	38,058	19 122	
1861	39,647	19 706	
1862	41,129	20 190	21 318
1863	43,118	20 906	
1864	44,795	21 450	
1865	46,960	21 791	
1866	47,648	22 255	
1867	49 056	23 644	23 821
1868	51,000	23 296	
1869	53,177	23 628	
1870	54,713	24 315	
1871	56,755	24 911	
1872	58,640	25 421	26 185
1873	60,296	25 915	
1874	62,027	26 229	
1875	63,798	26 643	
1876	64,916	26 776	

Table showing the admission of certified Lunatics and Idiots into Asylums or Single Houses in England and Wales during the eighteen years, 1859–1876.

Years	Admissions of certified lunatics during each year.	Proportion to 10,000 of the estimated population.	Proportion to 10 000 of the population in various groups of years
1859	9,310	4 729	4 715
1860	9,512	4 779	
1861	9,329	4 637	
1862	9,078	4 456	4 590
1863	8,914	4 322	
1864	8,473	4 538	
1865	10,424	4 930	
1866	10,051	4 695	
1867	10,681	4 904	5 150
1868	11,213	5 109	
1869	11,194	5 037	
1870	11,620	5 164	
1871	12,573	5 519	
1872	12,176	5 278	5 655
1873	12,773	5 469	
1874	13,329	5 594	
1875	14,317	5 979	
1876	14,396	5 934	

¹ *The Physiology and Pathology of Mind.* By Henry Maudsley, M.D. Second edition, p. 262.

Since 1876 the increase in the number of the insane in England and Wales has continued, so that on January 1, 1881, the total number had grown to the enormous figure of 73,113. Of these, 32,973 were male, and 40,140 female. We have no data at hand showing the amount of increase since 1881; but the experience represented by the above figures justifies the apprehension that that amount will be proportionate to that which occurred during the previous five years.

It will be observed that, according to these tables, the total numbers of insane persons in England and Wales increase during the period to which the tables refer much more rapidly than do the numbers of *admissions* of such persons to asylums or single houses. This disparity is partly due, we believe, to changes in the methods of registration—changes induced by four successive Acts of Parliament, and partly, also, to the increasing longevity of lunatics consequent on their improved treatment. This being the case, the most trustworthy evidence at present obtainable of the increase of insanity in England and Wales is afforded by the numbers of *admissions* during the period in question: and we learn from these that, whereas during the years 1859–1861 the number of persons admitted formed 4·715 out of every 10,000 of the estimated population, the proportion of admissions during the period 1872–1876 had risen to 5·65.

Now the question arises—To what is this deplorable increase mainly due? We do not hesitate to answer: it is mainly due to the habit of using alcoholic liquors as beverages, and not only to the extent producing intoxication, but in the “moderate” quantities taken by persons who regard themselves as especially temperate, and whose temperance is never doubted by those most intimate with them.

“Making all allowance,” says Dr. Blandford, “for the highly coloured pictures drawn by the advocates of total abstinence, it is probable that intemperance is on the increase rather than decreasing. Hence, I believe, springs the ever-renewed insanity of our lower classes. For as insanity has a tendency to die out like other diseases—to cause the extinction of a race, or itself to be overcome by the greater vigour of some of the stock—it is clear that the enormous insane population of our country must owe its insanity to ever-present causes—it cannot all have been inherited from our great-grandfathers. And if we could accurately ascertain the statistics of insanity in other countries—civilized, semi-civilized, or barbarous—I think it probable that we should find insanity in proportion to the use of intoxicating liquors or substances.”¹

Among the causes of insanity Dr. Tuke ranks intoxication first—“Intoxication, whatever the poison employed may be.” He adds: “We include the action of alcohol and allied stimulants, not only on

¹ *Insanity and its Treatment.* By G. F. Blandford, M.D. 1871. Page 130.

the individual taking them to excess, but upon the offspring; the condition of the children again causing further degeneracy in the succeeding generation." Referring to "insanity in relation to the working classes," he says: "Among the causes, intemperance unmistakably takes the lead. This is one of those facts which, amid much that is open to difference of opinion, would seem to admit of no reasonable doubt." He mentions that, of 3800 patients admitted into the Birmingham Borough Asylum during twenty-five years, "524, or 14 per cent., had their malady induced by drink, and that the total expenditure thus caused by intemperance amounted, in maintenance and cost of building, &c., to no less than £50,373 during that period. Some years ago [Dr. Tuke] calculated the percentage of cases caused by intemperance in the asylums of England, and found it to be about twelve." The Commissioners in Lunacy, whose data for judgment in the matter are the most ample, state it to be fourteen. This proportion would be immensely increased were we to add those cases in which domestic misery and pecuniary losses owed their origin to this vice. "Notwithstanding the laudable efforts of temperance societies," says Dr. Tuke, "the amount of wine annually consumed increases beyond the growth of the population. Between 1791 and 1800 the number of bottles per head amounted to $2\frac{1}{2}$, from 1811 to 1860 the number fell to $1\frac{1}{2}$, but at the present time the figure stands at somewhat more than 3. Drunkenness was increased by the Beer House Bill of 1830, which brought into existence in a single year about 30,000 new houses for the sale of liquor to be drunk on the premises. In 1860 and 1861 other measures were adopted facilitating the consumption of wine and spirits. These enactments have favoured the spread of insanity in England, or neutralized opposite influences.

"In France M. Lunier has shown that the consumption of alcohol nearly doubled between the years 1819 and 1869, and the cases of mental disease rose 59 per cent. among men, and 52 per cent. among women. He also finds that in those departments which do not cultivate either wine or cider, but produce alcohol, and where the annual consumption rose in twenty years from 3.46 lit. per head to 5.88, the insanity from drink rose from 9.72 to 22.31 per cent. with men, and from 2.77 to 4.14 with women."

Dr. Jarvis, quoted by Dr. Tuke, states that insanity increases and diminishes (other causes of insanity being equal) according to the degree in which intemperance extends, and supports his statement by the fact that, "while the cases received into the Worcester Asylum, United States, from drink were 19 per cent. of the admissions during four years when this indulgence was most prevalent among the surrounding population, they fell to 4.5 per cent. during a period of the same duration when the Temperance Reformation was at its height."

"The history of the daily mode of life of many members of the

Stock Exchange would reveal in the matter of diet," observes Dr. Tuke, "an amount of alcoholic imbibition in the form of morning 'nips,' wine at luncheon and at dinner, difficult to realize by many of less porous constitutions, and easily explaining the disastrous results which in many instances follow, sooner or later, as respects disturbances of the nervous system in one form or other. In fact, by the time dinner is due the stomach is in despair, and its owner finds it necessary to goad a lost appetite by strong pickles and spirits, ending with black coffee and some liqueur. When either dyspepsia or over-business work is set down as the cause of the insanity of such individuals, it should be considered what influence the amount of alcohol imbibed has exerted upon the final catastrophe as well as the assigned cause."¹

Persons who regard themselves, and who are regarded by their intimate friends, as decidedly temperate, who habitually take a moderate amount of some alcoholic fluid with lunch and dinner, and, it may be, what is called a "night-cap," never imagine that by doing so they are impairing the quality and functional power of their brains; and it must be admitted that direct and decisive evidence that they are doing so is rarely forthcoming, and is not easily obtained. But though evidence of the effects of such so-called "temperate habits" or "moderation" in taking alcoholic fluids on the brain is not easily obtained, evidence of the effects of such habits on other important organs of the body is abundant: medical literature teems with it. Irritation of the mucous membrane of the stomach, with more or less nausea and persistent dyspepsia, a disordered state of the liver, various phases of chronic inflammation of the kidneys—liable to develop into that fatal malady—Bright's disease, and gout, with its abundant progeny of ills too numerous to mention, are diseases which, undoubtedly, in a very large proportion of cases, are directly traceable to the habitual but moderate use of alcohol.

Now, if the various and grave diseases just enumerated are ordinary and frequently recurring results of the moderate use of intoxicating liquors, and if—as there is reason to believe is the case—the affinity of alcohol for nervous tissue is stronger than it is for any other of the bodily structures, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the habitual, though moderate, use of intoxicating liquors exerts an especially deteriorating influence on the brain—an influence which, though slow in its action and difficult to gauge or appreciate in individual cases, is none the less real, and the effects of which are at once deadening and permanent. "One striking functional derangement

¹ We beg to express our special obligation to Dr. Daniel Hack Tuke, from whose valuable and interesting books we have quoted several passages as well as the statistical tables given in the text. The titles of the books in question are respectively:—*Insanity in Ancient and Modern Life, with Chapters on its Prevention*. London, 1878; and *Chapters in the History of the Insane in the British Isles*. London, 1881.

of the nervous system under alcohol is that which is called *insomnia*, or sleeplessness. . . . No alcoholic sufferer is a truly natural sleeper. . . . *Epilepsy* from alcohol is sometimes manifested. Apoplexy is a second result from the same cause, and, probably, is a much more frequent result of alcoholic indulgence than is commonly supposed. . . . But the most determinate nervous injury resulting from the use of alcohol is paralysis." In some instances, "it commences with a long stage of muscular feebleness, *passes into mental alienation*, and finally into a loss of all volitional power."¹

Of the millions of cases in which persons, generally regarded as of temperate habits, complain, and present indubitable evidence, of prematurely failing memory, there are very few in which its impairment is believed by the persons complaining, or by their intimate friends, to be due in any degree to the habitual but temperate use of alcohol. Its influence on the memory is so insidious, so subtle, and so nearly imperceptible that the victim of it is unconscious of its action; and, indeed, it is impossible in any given case, in which the person in question has lived what is called a temperate life, to assign to the several causes of impairment of memory their due share in producing it. The assumption that the alcohol contained in "moderate" quantities of wine, beer, or "spirits," taken by persons habitually "temperate," is really the chief agent of the deterioration in question, can only be justified by a careful examination and consideration of the physiological effects of alcohol on animal tissue, and especially on nervous tissue; of the nature and extent of its agency in contributing to produce the various forms of mental disease from which an appallingly large proportion of the population of all "civilized" people suffer; of its effects on the nervous system in cases of persons who take alcohol, in some form or other, to "excess" only occasionally; and, finally, of its effects in cases in which it is taken habitually but in moderation, or in quantities insufficient to produce intoxication. Such an examination and consideration of those effects cannot fail, we believe, to produce the conviction that even the "moderate" use of alcohol habitually deteriorates the quality of nervous tissue, and, therefore, the quality and functions of the brain. Now, if the conviction just expressed be well founded, we are constrained to recognize that, inasmuch as memory is one of the chief cerebral functions, alcohol taken in any of the various quantities in which men habitually take it operates inevitably as one of the most powerful, if not the most powerful, agent in impairing the vigour and activity of this supremely important faculty. If a man takes a moderate amount of wine habitually, if his daily work is chiefly brain work, and, especially if he habitually sleeps during a shorter time than he ought to do, his mind will gradually become enfeebled; and, obviously, in such a case, it is impossible

¹ *The Field of Disease: a Book of Preventive Medicine.* By B. W. Richardson, M.D., F.R.S. Page 481.

to determine to what extent the enfeeblement is due to each of its several co-operative causes, and recorded experiments enabling us to ascertain the relative force of each of these causes are, so far as we know, wholly wanting. But, happily, we are enabled to adduce one case, and a most instructive one it is, proving in a striking manner how great is the potency of alcohol in impairing the memory, and therefore, as we maintain, the mind generally. The history of this case, written by the gentleman who was the subject of it, is as follows :—

“Beer instead of water formed the staple article of drink in the house of my parents, and I acquired early the habit of drinking beer in considerable quantities. I must add, however, that this beer was less heavy than that usually drunk. As a student, and later, in earlier manhood, I found that the social intercourse which was carried on around the beer tankards induced a kind of gentle dreamy intoxication; which continued as an almost permanent state during several hours of each day. I was still indulging in the habit of beer-drinking when an appointment in connection with a distinguished scientific institution was offered to me. At this time I began to drink the ordinary English beer, the great alcoholic strength of which, as I know now, lessened the acuteness and energy of my intellect; but I ascribed those effects, of which I was distinctly conscious, to any cause rather than the real one. Deep inroads were made by degrees in my originally splendid memory, and as time advanced became increasingly remarkable. Facts once at my fingers’-ends had to be verified by recurring to their original sources, much time being thus lost. Difficult and now researches could only be made with increasing effort; and a still more striking phenomenon filled me at the time with despair: I was invited to give courses of lectures at one of the London Colleges, and some of my pupils wishing to extend their studies beyond the scope of the lectures themselves, frequently remained after the lectures were over to consult me on points of special difficulty, the explanations of which usually required an extended chain of argument carried on in mathematical language; the older methods of most demonstrations of this kind have long ago given way to modern methods, in which great brevity of exposition is frequently obtained by an ingenious but generally artificial process; now, when going to my classes, I accustomed myself to go over in my mind what I intended to place before some of the more advanced pupils, but often completely lost for the time all recollection of the special and novel method of exposition which I had intended to adopt, and was obliged to fall back on my memory of the older method, and to make use of it instead. It often happened to me, however, on my way home again to recollect distinctly what I had previously forgotten. The accidental reading of a newspaper report of a lecture on alcohol by Dr. B. W. Richardson changed the whole course of my intellectual life. His argument came home to me with extraordinary force. Fifteen years have passed since I laid down that paper with the determination never again to taste alcoholic drinks in any form, and I have carried out my resolution in spite of the strongest social temptations. I gave up the habit, not because I thought it wrong, but solely because I became impressed with the conviction that it would be an experiment worth trying in order to test the, to me, unmistakable soundness of Dr. Richardson’s argument.

“Now, what has been the result of my experiment? It has been to me an incalculable gain. The first result was a slow but complete recovery of my memory, and a great increase to my power of making fresh intellectual acquisitions. . . . I have certainly extended the range of my attainments

during the last fifteen years wider and deeper than I had done during an equal length of time in that portion of life which is generally considered as most favourable to the acquisition of knowledge. I have during the same fifteen years never met with the least difficulty of mastering subjects generally considered abstruse and hard to understand, nor have I to struggle for the recovery of anything previously acquired."

Next in rank to alcohol as an agent of deterioration of the quality and functions of the nervous system we place tobacco. Fortunately, however, its injurious influence, though great, is far less than that of alcohol. So far as we are aware, it does not contribute in any appreciable degree to increase the number of inmates of our asylums. Its use is almost as extensive as that of alcohol, and it appears to be decidedly on the increase. Its deleterious effects are vehemently disputed: those in favour of smoking maintain that its effects are almost wholly beneficent, while the opponents of the abuse of tobacco are very emphatic in their demonstration and denunciation of its baneful influence. In order to prove that that influence is baneful, we shall adopt much the same method as that which we have used in respect to alcohol. We shall note the effects of poisonous doses of tobacco both on the system generally and on the brain especially. Also, we shall endeavour to show what are those effects on the organism in cases of its habitual, and more or less moderate, use, and, particularly, what are its effects on the eye and brain, whence we shall be able to infer the nature of its influence on the cerebral functions.

There is a general consensus of opinion held by authoritative writers on *Materia Medica* concerning the poisonous nature of tobacco. Mr. Muter says: "Tobacco is a really powerful poison, causing intense vomiting, and purging, with cold sweats, and entire muscular relaxation."¹ Dr. Ringer uses similar language. He remarks: "Tobacco produces nausea and sickness, accompanied by great weakness and faintness. It confuses the ideas, brain, and sight, enfeebles the pulse, and makes the skin cold and clammy with profuse sweating."² Dr. Phillips remarks: "The most familiar physiological effects of tobacco are those which are experienced by young smokers, who rarely fail to poison themselves to a greater or less extent in their first trials. Nausea, giddiness, vomiting, or a feeling of dead'y sickness, with cold sweatings and exceedingly feeble pulse, are the ordinary results of first attempts to smoke tobacco which is even moderately strong." Cases of fatal and nearly fatal results have ensued from smoking, the symptoms being "probably due to the inhaling of smoke into the lungs."³ "In one remarkable and exceptional instance," says Dr. Richardson, "I witnessed in a man fatal

¹ *A Key to the Organic Materia Medica* By John Muter, M.A., F.C.S. Third edition, page 287.

² *A Handbook of Therapeutics*. By Sydney Ringer, M.D. Sixth edition, page 460.

³ *Materia Medica and Therapeutics. Vegetable Kingdom*. By C. D. F. Phillips, M.D. Page 90.

symptoms which had been induced partly from excessive smoking. In this instance, death came on from a paralysis, involving, I may say, the whole nervous system, for all the motor powers, voluntary and involuntary, together with the mental powers, collapsed."¹

"There are a few people whom no amount of care and skill exercised in the taking of tobacco, nor any moderation in the dose used, can save from unmistakable poisoning whenever they indulge in it."² Dr. Phillips states that "fatal results have not infrequently followed the administration of the decoction of tobacco in enema."

A lunatic who swallowed an ounce or an ounce and a half of crude tobacco "became suddenly insensible and motionless, with all the muscles relaxed, very feeble respiration and pulse, strong contraction of the pupils, and (later on) violent tetanic convulsions and profuse purging, with blood and mucous." He died seven or eight hours after taking the tobacco; and the post-mortem examination revealed "congestion of the brain, the medulla oblongata, and the Pons Varolii."

"The physiological effects of nicotine—the alkaloid prepared from tobacco—are nearly those of tobacco solution, but in a more powerful form. An example of its most decided action is offered by the case of the victim of Count Bocarné, who was poisoned with nicotine, and was believed to have died in less than five minutes; and by a case of suicide recorded by Taylor, in which the alkaloid proved fatal in from three to five minutes.

"The habitual use of tobacco in the years before and immediately succeeding the development of puberty has a most prejudicial influence. There can be no question that more than anything, except drinking, it hinders the growth and development of the higher nervous centres, and that both intellect and moral character are capable of being most seriously damaged by the depressing agency continuously exerted during the developmental period. From a comparison of different reports it appears that in the most swiftly fatal cases the action of the poison has been almost entirely expended upon the nervous system and heart."³

Considering the evidence of the competent authorities just cited, our readers cannot fail to recognize the truth of the conclusion—*first*, that tobacco is a powerful poison; *secondly*, that as, when given in large doses, its effects are deadly, its habitual use in small doses, as in smoking, is likely to exert, and not infrequently does exert, a deteriorating influence on the human organism; and, *thirdly*, that that influence is chiefly manifested in the nervous system. Of course, we cannot observe the brains of living men, but we can observe their eyes: now the condition of the interior of the eye is in many cases a condition from which the state of health of the brain may be more

¹ *The Field of Disease*, p. 497

² *Stimulants and Narcotics, their Material Relations*. By F. E. Anstey, M.D. Page 145.

³ *Materia Medica and Therapeutics Vegetable Kingdom*. By C. D. F. Phillips, M.D. Pages 91, 92, 93.



or less correctly inferred. Hence, in those cases in which morbid conditions of the eye have been induced by smoking, we are justified in assuming that the baneful influence of that habit has been extended to the brain. That the eye is not infrequently observed to have been thus injured we proceed to prove by citing the testimony of eminent oculists. Desmarres Senior, quoted by Galezowski, signalized the existence of that form of partial paralysis of the optic nerve called nicotic amblyopia; and Sichel Senior, also quoted by Galezowski, declared, in a communication made to the Academy of Science in 1863, that few persons can consume daily more than twenty grammes (five drachms) of tobacco during a long time by smoking without weakening the sight, and often the memory. Dr. Galezowski remarks: "The existence of nicotic amblyopia has also been verified by Hutchinson, Critchett, and Apostoli. For a long time I denied the existence of nicotic amblyopia, but I have since become convinced that, although it is very rare, it may become so pronounced as to assume the form of a true amaurosis" (complete paralysis of the optic nerve). This distinguished oculist mentions a case of a man forty-seven years old, who had become so blind that he could with difficulty distinguish day from night. He took no spirits, but smoked excessively. The treatment, which included total abstinence from the use of tobacco, effected the complete recovery of his sight.¹

Bader says that the habit of smoking often produces spasm, or partial paralysis, or complete paralysis of the ciliary muscle (the muscle which effects the focal accommodation of the eye for the vision of near objects), and he thus describes the partial paralysis of the optic nerves caused by the habitual use of tobacco:—"The patients generally are of middle age, thin, of pale yellow complexions, and rarely complain of pain in or about the eyes. They generally state that the impairment of vision has progressed slowly. Vision may, however, within six months be reduced to a mere perception of light. The impairment of vision (if the disease is progressing) reaches this degree in from six to eighteen months. Both eyes are affected, though in varying degrees. One eye may become blind without the patient being aware of it. Night blindness and decrease of acuteness of vision for distance are often the earliest objective symptoms. Photopsia (a subjective appearance or sense of light due to morbid action of the cerebral centres in which the optic nerves are rooted) frequently appears, and sometimes after all vision is lost. With the ophthalmoscope we observe at first hyperæmia of the optic disc, with anæmia of the retina. Anæmia and atrophy of the optic disc and retina finally follow. The greater the diminution of the number of arteries in the retina the greater is the impairment of vision."²

¹ *Traité des Maladies des Yeux* Par X. Galezowski. Deuxième Edition, pp 601-2.

² *The Natural and Morbid Changes of the Human Eye, and their Treatment.* By C. Bader. Pages 455-6.

Additional evidence of the influence of tobacco in producing amblyopia is afforded by Dr. Zander, who says that in cases of this affection, "apparently due to excessive smoking, there seems to be no doubt that the abandonment of tobacco has been highly useful; and I have lately heard from Mr. Wordsworth of a case in which the disease was arrested by the reduction of the daily dose of tobacco from forty cigarettes to six."¹

The foregoing evidence proves, as it seems to us, quite decisively that tobacco, however used, tends to impair the health and functions of the brain. We have seen that, according to one witness, "it confuses the ideas, brain, and sight;" that, according to another, it produced fatal paralysis; that, according to another, it produced, in a fatal case, "congestion of the brain, the medulla oblongata, and the Pons Varolii;" and that, according to a fourth, "it hinders more than anything, except drinking, the growth and development of the higher nervous centres." Atrophy of the optic nerves (*amaurosis*, or complete blindness), and partial atrophy of those nerves (*amblyopia*, or partial blindness), are, surely, very grave diseases; and, as these are affections of the largest of the cerebral nerves, it is scarcely possible that they can become diseased without the adjoining part of the brain becoming involved also. Dr. Sichel may well say, therefore, that few persons can continue great smokers for a long time without weakening the memory as well as the sight.

We can only add a few words, concerning the influence of the habitual use of opium and morphia in deteriorating the brain. The custom of opium-smoking by white men is undoubtedly spreading, and we fear rapidly, in the United States. It is already being practised also in Australia. In 1880 the number of Chinamen in California was upwards of 105,000. About 25 per cent. of these people smoke opium, and thus consume about 60,000 pounds of opium yearly. They introduced the custom of opium-smoking to white men on the American continent; and although it was not until 1868, as is believed, that opium was smoked for the first time in America by a white man, it is estimated that in 1880 there were already 6000 white men in the United States who had become habitual opium-smokers! At that date, the custom, first adopted in San Francisco, had gained adherents in Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, and New York—the amount of opium then smoked by the whites yearly being over 28,000 pounds.

Fortunately, the evils induced by opium-smoking are less than those caused by chronic alcoholism; but, though this is the case, and though opium-smoking produces insanity much less frequently than alcohol does, the evils it entails are great and numerous, and its

¹ *The Ophthalmoscope its Varieties and its Use* Translated from the German of Dr. Adolf Zander by R. B. Carter, F.R.C.S. Page 220.

power in inducing mental degeneration is one of its notable characteristics.

"The first effects of opium-smoking upon the mind of the habitué are disinclination for continued mental effort, weakening of the will power, wavering in decision, and loss of memory. . . There is sometimes a failure to co-ordinate ideas. . . There is a tendency to falsify without any reason for doing so, and the mental aspect of a confirmed smoker is anything but pleasing. He evinces dulness, apathy, disinclination for mental effort of any kind, groundless fears, weakness, vacillation, and outbursts of violent temper. . . . Suicide may be committed during a fit of despondency, especially by women and young girls."¹

In cases of "decided excess" general tremor is sometimes observable, and, more frequently, tremor of isolated muscles—most marked in the hands and tongue. "The pupils are, as a rule, evenly contracted; but when the effect of the drug has ceased they often become widely dilated. All who have smoked opium for any length of time complain that they are getting near-sighted."² The general constitutional effects of habitual opium-smoking are all of one type—devitalizing and degenerative.

The habit of taking opium or morphia by the stomach, or of injecting morphia hyperdermically, is seemingly attended with even more serious consequences than those induced by opium-smoking; and, unhappily, there are good reasons for believing that the habitual subcutaneous injection of morphia is very extensively practised. When once adopted, it is rarely abandoned; nevertheless cases of liberation from the habit do occur: we have recently seen a signal and praiseworthy example of self-delivery from a deeply rooted habit of this kind; moreover, the person in question has not only abandoned the use of morphia, but has become a total abstainer from all forms of alcohol, the result being that he looks ten years younger and twenty times more vigorous, both physically and mentally, than he did before he had effected—by means of his resolute will—his remarkable regeneration. We have seen two other cases recently in which the downward path has long been and still continues to be trodden, and in which the cerebral health and vigour of the persons in question are being steadily and surely impaired. We are not acquainted with any statistics throwing light on the question, to what extent does the habit of morphia-taking impair the mental health? We can only affirm that in all those cases in which it obtains its effects are peculiarly disastrous, and that, so far as we know, every medical man is, from his experience, impressed with the fact of its prevalence.

Excessive mental work is another notably powerful factor in lessening the vigour and functional activity of the brain, and we

¹ *Opium-Smoking in America and China. A Study of its Prevalence and Effects, Immediate and Remote, on the Individual and the Nation.* By H. H. Cane, M.D. Pages 84, 85, 89.

² *Ibid.*, p. 91.

cannot reprobate too emphatically the very injurious habit practised by a large number of persons of forcing themselves to work mentally when their cerebral energy is already reduced to a minimum. The habit of thus sinning against themselves is especially prevalent among literary men, and also among the rising generation of young boys and girls, as well as of young men and women, who are compelled to force and strain the growing brain beyond its natural strength in order to prepare themselves to pass the preposterously numerous and increasingly difficult examinations which in all departments of study, from the simplest to the most recondite, are now the order of the day. This deplorable habit deteriorates the health of the whole body, for the brain, which, when in vigorous health, imparts a tonic influence to the whole system and co-ordinates its several organs into harmonious action, is then more or less disabled from fulfilling this among its many important functions; and the various organs, especially the stomach and alimentary canal, becoming disordered, react on the brain, and thus the morbid action and reaction, continuing, result in lowering the healthy vitality and energy of those organs, as well as of the brain itself. We are justified in affirming that mental workers who rigorously avoid working when they are tired really do more work and of far better quality in a given time than they can accomplish in a much longer time if they work while they are fatigued; and we are certain that the mental health and strength of a large number of literary, professional, and business men are broken down, and more or less permanently deteriorated, by their neglect of the teachings of experience in this respect.

Insufficient sleep also conduces to mental impairment. Many persons seem to flatter themselves that Nature has made an exception in their favour, enabling them to dispense with the amount of sleep, occupying seven or eight hours out of each twenty-four, needed by ordinary mortals. Undoubtedly different persons differ to some extent in respect to the normal amount of sleep which they respectively require; but it may be safely stated, as a general rule, that they who, during prolonged periods, deny themselves the amount of sleep they normally need will, in the long run, have to pay for their folly in endeavouring to cheat Nature of her rightful claim, and the penalty exacted will probably be in the form of persistent insomnia or some other functional disorder of the brain.

There is a widespread superstition, cherished by the great majority of the people, that to sleep immediately after they have taken food is to endanger the health, to favour the onset of apoplexy, &c.—a superstition based on the assumption that during sleep the brain is normally congested. There is, no doubt, such a thing as congestive sleep, but during normal sleep the brain is anæmic. When a person has taken a fairly abundant lunch or dinner, the stomach demands a special afflux of blood wherewith to accomplish its work of diges-

tion; no organ can more easily comply with that demand than the brain, which, when in full activity, is suffused with a maximum amount of the vital fluid. But a derivation of blood from the brain to the stomach can only take place, except in exceptionally full-blooded and vigorous persons, on the condition that the cerebral functions be meanwhile partially or wholly suspended. Hence many people after taking dinner feel indisposed for mental action, and not a few long for sleep. The already partially anæmic brain would fain yield up to the stomach a still further supply of blood and yield itself up to refreshing sleep. Doing so it gains new strength; meanwhile digestion proceeds energetically; and, soon, body and mind are again equipped to continue in full force the battle of life. But superstition, the child of ignorance, intervenes, declares that sleep during digestion is dangerous, admonishes the would-be sleepers to struggle against their perilous inclinations, and, though telling them that after dinner they may sit awhile, assures them of the wisdom of the adage—"after supper walk a mile." The millions of its victims continue, therefore, the strife to which it condemns them, and ignore the suggestions offered to them by the lower animals, who have always practised the lessons of sound physiology by sleeping after feeding whenever they are allowed to do so. Hence the human brain and human stomach of such victims contend with each other during the digestive process: the brain, impelled by superstition, strives to work and demands blood to work with, while the stomach, stimulated by its contents, strives to carry on its marvellous chemistry, and demands an ample supply of blood for the purpose. The result of the struggle is that neither is able to do its work well: the brain is enfeebled by being denied its natural rest during the digestive process, and the healthy function of the stomach degenerates into dyspepsia. The injury to the general health, and notably to the health of the brain, which the superstition in question inflicts is incalculable; and we do not hesitate to affirm that, whenever the practice of sleeping after the chief meal shall become general, the health of the brain and of the stomach alike, and, consequently, the enjoyment of life, will be largely increased.

Reviewing the facts, an account of which has been given in this article, our readers can scarcely fail to be appalled by the enormous magnitude of the evils which men bring on themselves by their folly, their self-indulgence, their neglect of self-discipline, and by their more or less wilful ignorance. In 1881 there were, as we have seen, over 73,000 insane persons in England and Wales, and, considering the rate of increase of the insane population in the light of experience, we are justified in assuming that at the present time that population amounts to 80,000. According to the statement of the Commissioners in Lunacy, 14 per cent. of this vast crowd, or 11,200

persons, have become insane through intemperance ! Moreover, as the total number of persons admitted annually into public and private asylums for the insane is now about 15,000, it appears, if we assume that 14 per cent. of these admissions are due to intemperance, that 2100 persons are admitted *annually* from this cause. If this be so, how immense and incalculable must be the cerebral deterioration of various kinds, though not amounting to indubitable insanity, which it also effects !

Concerning the extent to which the practice of smoking prevails no trustworthy information is, or is likely to be, procurable ; but that its practice is almost universal we all know, and that it is rapidly increasing seems probable. But, of course, statistics showing to what extent the eye and brain are injured by the use of tobacco do not yet exist.

What is the numerical relation of men and women to each other who indulge in the several practices above adverted to we have no means of knowing. Of the total number of ascertained lunatics and idiots in England and Wales on January 1, 1881, 32,973 were males and 10,140 were females. Of course, if of the latter the proportion who became insane through intemperance be the same as the proportion of the whole insane population which became insane from that cause, it is manifest that the number of women is much greater than the number of men who are rendered insane by alcohol. We do not think, however, that if the exact facts of the matter were known they would justify this inference. Out of 29,000 cases of drunkenness brought before the London magistrates in 1883, those of men exceeded those of women to the extent of 3000.¹ Moreover, the number of insane women is greater than the number of insane men among the pauper lunatics only, the numbers being 36,486 females and 28,886 males ; but in respect to the lunatics of the higher class, viz., those confined in private houses, the numerical relation of the sexes is reversed : of these there are 4087 males and 3654 females. What is actually known concerning the habits of the upper and more educated classes of English society in respect to alcoholic drinking leads us to expect this result. Moreover, as already stated, during the twenty years, from 1849 to 1869, while the insanity from drink of Frenchmen rose from 9.72 to 22.31, the insanity of Frenchwomen from the same cause rose only from 2.77 to 4.14.

Loose statements, unsupported by trustworthy evidence, have often been made to the effect that Englishwomen of the higher classes are to a large extent intemperate, and that not a few of them become intoxicated by secret drinking ; but we feel assured that such statements are gross exaggerations, and that, whatever may be the amount of intemperance practised by women of the classes in question, it is incom-

parably less than that indulged in by men of the same classes. Though we know nothing definite as to the comparative frequency with which the two sexes intoxicate themselves with morphia, we know that opium-smoking in the United States is chiefly practised by men; and that tobacco-smoking is, in the United Kingdom at least, an all but exclusively masculine indulgence. We cherish the hope, and, indeed, the belief, that the refined feelings, the æsthetic tastes, and the moral purity which have long been exemplified by women to a degree far surpassing that which is generally manifested by men, will still guard them from becoming victims of the noxious practices in question, and will constrain them, with steadily increasing force, to exert their powerful influence to induce the men with whom they may be acquainted to abstain from the seductive poisons which, as we have seen, destroy the minds of thousands and injure the minds of tens of thousands of human beings every year. The health of mankind, continuously vitiated by the selfish indulgences and sensualism of men, is renewed in each generation of children, because they derive half their nature from their comparatively non-contaminated mothers, and hence it was justly said by A. Bronson Alcott: "Women and children are perpetual Messiahs." By their efforts to abolish the evils we have dwelt on in this article the women of England will, we trust, prove their right to their share in that exalted title.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by men of high mental power and culture who while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: ITS FRIENDS AND ITS ENEMIES.

BY A HOME RULER

PEOPLE are told every day by Liberal politicians that as the Irish people, speaking through the large majority of their chosen representatives wish for Home Rule, it is the duty of England to accede to their wishes. They say it is only an Irish Parliament which can solve the difficulties which have retarded the progress and disturbed the peace of the country. To this Parliament it is proposed to assign full authority over the police, the maintenance of law and order, and all details of internal policy, while foreign policy and national defence, as well as all financial questions relating both to these subjects and to the contributions to be paid by Ireland to the Imperial Treasury, are to remain under the control of the Imperial Parliament. Those who hesitate to give an immediate assent to these propositions, or to the immediate grant of Home Rule in some similar form to that proposed, are denounced as Tories, or as deserters from the Liberal faith.

But many of these so-called heretics, while agreeing that the Irish people are, if they consider the subject fairly and without bias, probably the best judges of what is good for Ireland, think that to make the immediate constitutional changes proposed by the Liberal leaders would not be a Liberal policy in the true sense of the word Liberal. They think that by so doing the country would abandon some of the chief principles on which Liberal policy has hitherto been based.

I cannot myself see how, after a full consideration of the subject, any other view can be taken of the question. Though I am an

Irishman, and one who has long wished for and still continues to wish for Home Rule on true Liberal principles, I do not understand how, if it be introduced under the auspices of the present Home Rule party, it is possible to ensure full justice being done to all classes of the people, and to have all conflicting rights and claims fairly and impartially considered.

Home Rule for Ireland, as the best means of finding a cure for Irish grievances, has a most seductive sound. It seems almost a truism to say that it is the people living in Ireland as their home who best know their own difficulties, and who possess the local knowledge and patriotic sympathies fitting them to devise the best remedies for the unprosperous condition of the country. Remedies so devised and accepted, after full discussion, by the chosen representatives of the people, would, it certainly seems probable, be preferred to those emanating from an alien assembly. The knowledge that these measures were approved of by those whom the people knew and trusted would be likely to lead to their general acceptance as those best adapted to develop the resources of the country, to improve the relations between contending classes, and to substitute peaceful and united effort for perpetual wrangling and dispute.

But though, according to Liberal axioms, the best government for a country is that of the whole people by the whole people fully and fairly represented, there is a third qualification which must be fulfilled before the government can be pronounced to be ideally good. It must act for the benefit of the whole people, and its measures must be so framed as not to despoil one class for the profit of another, or subject the progressive parts of the country to the rule of those which are backward and impoverished.

But what are the probabilities that these desiderata would be secured if Home Rule were now established?

The measures set before the Irish Parliament must, for the most part, be proposed by Ministers representing the majority, and unless these Ministers are statesmen prepared to do their best within certain limits, to act fairly and impartially even to their opponents, it is not likely that their policy will fulfil the requisite conditions of a good government.

The representatives returned to an Irish Parliament would probably be much the same class of men who are now sent to Westminster, and it is from them that the Ministry would be taken. In order to find out what their policy would probably be if they were entrusted with the government of the country, it is necessary to take note of their past public speeches and actions.

The state of the country during the last few years, omitting for the present all reference to the so-called Coercion Act and its consequences, may be shortly described as follows:

The antagonism between races and creeds, which was one of the

great difficulties in former times, has to a great extent retired into the background ; but, in spite of the legislation on the subject, and the efforts made to adjust equitably the respective rights and claims of the two parties, the differences between landlords and tenants are as acute or more acute than ever. There are still large tracts of country where agriculture is almost the only industry, and where the population is too large for the soil to support even in fairly prosperous seasons. In these districts the people must farm, starve, beg, or emigrate ; and farming profits have everywhere in Ireland, as elsewhere, greatly decreased in the last few years, owing to a general fall in prices. Manufactures, except in parts of Ulster, languish. All attempts to make more use than has hitherto been done of the great natural resources of the country, to develop the fisheries, and improve the railway communication, have produced little general effect in bettering the condition of the people as a whole, or in making larger numbers of them try other means of livelihood than farming. Throughout the greater part of the country, the most prosperous and flourishing classes are political agitators, publicans, and money-lenders. Among the last class must be reckoned many small shopkeepers, whose lendings begin with goods given on credit at prices ensuring a very large return for the risk incurred.

What have those who call themselves Nationalists and Home Rulers done to remedy this state of things ?

To begin with the land question, which must first be settled before anything effectual can be done to cure other evils. In dealing with the disputes between landlords and tenants, they have on all occasions, both in and out of Parliament, denounced the landlords as authors of all the tenants' woes, and instead of looking at both sides of the question, have argued as if the landlords were always wrong, and the tenants who opposed them always right. As to the other points noted above, they have scarcely touched any of them, except to denounce all proposals for promoting emigration from congested districts to other countries. In lieu of these proposals they have advocated the transfer of tenants from over-populated districts to those less thickly peopled ; but attempts made under their auspices to carry out this transfer have ended in a miserable failure. They have advocated and secured the passing of a law for the building of labourers' cottages, which were much wanted ; but these cottages have been too often used as a means of coercing and annoying their opponents, by taking their land against their will when more suitable land was available elsewhere. Manufactures they propose to promote by protection, or, in other words, by raising to Irishmen the price of all protected articles—that is, they would relieve the poverty of the country by making the people pay more than they do now for manufactured goods.

When we turn from their speeches to examine their actions we find the best evidence of what they have done in the conduct of the National League. They have been organizers and managers of this society from its first beginnings, and have there shown what their practical policy is. It is by looking at their proceedings in this capacity that we can best see what they are likely to do if the government of the country were placed in their hands.

The National League was started as a successor to the Land League, which had been condemned as illegal. It has formed a network of branches extending over about three-fourths of the country, each provided with able officers, who are its active and energetic agents. They are not only recruiters and managers of mere formal business, but keep accurate accounts of the dispositions of those living in their respective jurisdictions, and of what they do for or against the national cause.

If the League had been really, as its name imports, a union of all classes of people who wished to work for the prosperity of Ireland, while doing justice to all without respect of persons, the League ought to, and could, have given most valuable aid to Government in soothing the violence of factions, and showing that if Home Rule were granted home affairs would be treated in a broad, equitable, and liberal spirit. A real National League would have tried to unite all classes, and, in dealing with the land question, which most urgently required solution, it would have treated the landlords, no less than the tenants, as integral parts of the nation, and not as aliens and usurpers. It would have recognized that landlords have rights as well as tenants, and in trying to obtain the reduction of rents, which all admit to be necessary, it would have tried to proceed by amicable negotiation. If, again, it were not a National League, but a trades union of tenants combining to obtain, by legal and orderly methods, such reductions in their rents and such other concessions as they felt were their due, no Liberal would have opposed such aspirations, and all would have rejoiced in whatever just success rewarded their efforts.

Instead of acting on these principles, or in this spirit, the promoters of the League have done everything in their power to stir up strife between landlords and tenants, even in districts where their previous relations were most amicable. They have tried everywhere to secure support for their aggressive policy by appealing to the selfish instincts of the people, and telling them that, if they only fight steadily without flinching, they will secure their lands without paying more than a nominal rent or price for them.

They have not in the least relaxed the virulence of the language they used to employ against the landlords, before the passing of the Acts giving tenants larger rights of property in their holdings than had been formerly allowed them, and before they had been made

practically partners of their respective landlords. They have declared over and over again, and still continue to reiterate, their intention to root landlordism out of the country, and to reduce the landlord's share to the prairie value of the land. It is upon this prairie value that they propose to estimate the price of the landlord's share, should the land be bought by the tenant. They have used the influence of the National League to secure all-round percentages in the reductions of rents, without reference to the value of the land and the numerous other data an equitable tribunal would carefully consider before formulating its claims, especially when it possessed the same ample means as the National League for ascertaining the real facts of each case. Instead of trying, as really patriotic statesmen would do, to secure the aid of the landlords, they have, like the Jacobins of the French Revolution, proclaimed eternal war with them. They have, by a summary judgment, condemned as only worthy of destruction a class of men who, whatever the faults of some of them may have been, have, for many years past, tried as a body to do their duty to their tenants. To do otherwise would have been folly on their part. Every sensible man knows that, though a harsh landlord may, by rack-renting, gain a temporarily larger income than the land can fairly pay from tenants so eager to obtain land and so ready to promise very high rents as the Irish peasantry, he only by doing this impoverishes his tenants and deteriorates his property. Land tilled by an impoverished tenantry, who have not the capital to do justice to it, must grow yearly less valuable. As for the tenants, the League has treated them even worse than the landlords. It has made it its business to keep the country in a perpetual state of what is practically covert war; and all honours and places of profit which the League has to bestow are reserved for the most violent partisans, from whom its officers and agents are selected. The great majority of the tenants are treated as the rank and file of the army—as no better than mere food for powder. It is they who have to pay the contributions in support of the League, to subscribe to the testimonials it advocates, and to run all the real risks of the campaign. It is they who are subject to prosecutions for disobeying the law while obeying the orders of the League; and when, by its orders, rents on any estate are left unpaid so long and so persistently as to render evictions necessary, it is they who have to live on the scanty allowance doled out to evicted tenants, while the leaders live in luxury, and have till recently incurred little or no danger. It is the promoters and managers of the League who profit by disorder, while among the tenants it is only the shrewdest and most unscrupulous who, by using their influence and position as officers and trusted adherents of the League, contrive to enrich themselves, while the main body of the tenants suffer and pay. As for the ordinary tenant, who wishes to pursue his calling as a farmer quietly, without joining in

the agitation, he finds himself in a constant dilemma. If he does not become a slave to the League, he incurs its enmity, and if, in obedience to its orders, he refuses to pay his rent, or to make a settlement with his landlord, he renders himself liable to legal punishment. All tenants living on the numerous estates selected by the League as the battle-fields between them and the landlords must, while the dominion of the League lasts, live in a perpetual state of fear and trembling.

The League, by its rules against reserving land for grazing purposes, arrogates to itself the right of laying down the law as to what a man shall do with his own property; while by those against land-grabbing it takes away from the industrious tenant one of the chief incentives to exertion, by forbidding him to take land from which another tenant has been evicted, and so add to the area of his own holding and increase his income. These rules practically attempt to reduce the industrious tenants to the level of the less provident and most unscrupulous, as it leaves the latter class in the possession of their lands without paying any rent unless the landlord chooses to eject the tenant and leave the land vacant. They thus reward the turbulent and dishonest tenants, and fine those who are industrious and honest, by interfering with their liberty and preventing them from adding to their resources. Every good landlord feels that eviction is in most cases a serious evil both to landlords and tenants, yet in some cases it is the kindest thing that can be done to the tenant, and in others it is necessary as a last resort, if the land is not to be allowed to deteriorate in value, and the landlord to lose his legal share of the profits. Where holdings are too small to support the tenant and his family, it is better that some should be amalgamated with others, and that some of the tenants should seek their living elsewhere, rather than all should continue a hopeless struggle in which defeat is inevitable. The National League has quite disregarded these considerations; and besides giving a scanty allowance to maintain evicted tenants in idleness, it has done nothing whatever to help them.

But it is not enough for the National League to appeal to tenants to join in taking the landlords' property without paying a fair share for it, or to pass decrees subversive of the liberty and confiscating the property both of landlords and tenants. It must also, to maintain its authority, find the means of enforcing its orders and instructions, and this is done by the odious and immoral practice of boycotting. This is very different from the "exclusive dealing" which it is interpreted to be by English Liberal leaders. When a tenant takes a lease of land on which the National League has placed its veto, or when he or any one else disobeys any of the orders of the League, shows himself to be lukewarm in supporting the national cause, or incurs the enmity of any of the leaders of his branch, he is liable to

be denounced and convicted by the branch of the League within whose jurisdiction he lives. The punishment of boycotted persons proceeds from petty persecution to prolonged moral torture ; when rigorously inflicted, no one is allowed to work for them, to supply them with provisions, or hold any communication with them ; and any one who disobeys these regulations is subjected to the same penalties as the persons denounced. By substituting this process for the murders by which the secret societies which preceded the Land and National Leagues used to punish their opponents, the National League say that they have made crime to cease out of the land ; but it is plain to the meanest capacity that they only advocate one crime instead of another, and that boycotting, if relentlessly carried out, is merely a disguised system of torture ending in slow murder, instead of the sudden death by which unpopular persons used to meet their end. Fortunately for the people, the National League is not yet supreme throughout the country, and there are other agencies which protect boycotted persons, and places where party spirit and fear of the League has not entirely killed natural and kindly feelings towards some at least of those who have been denounced as enemies to the people. Let us hope also that all branches of the League are not equally cruel and intolerant. By their organized appeals to greed, by raising in the minds of their dupes vain hopes of unlimited prosperity should the cause they call national gain the victory, by rewarding active agents and giving them the means of enriching themselves, and by intimidating opponents and neutrals, the League has succeeded in gaining complete control over an ignorant and credulous electorate, and consequently ensure the return of their partisans in all elections.

But this mingled system of blandishment and intimidation did not, after trial, appear to the leaders of the people sufficiently effective in reducing rents, and, what is in their eyes more important, securing the adhesion of the tenants, and they have in the last two years added to their weapons of offence that known as the Plan of Campaign. This has not been officially adopted by the League, but it has been advocated and enforced on all estates where it has been employed by the most active leaders of that body. In carrying it out they start with the proposition, though the tenants are only one of the parties to the contract between them and the landlord, that they alone have the right to say what portion of the profits of these farms the latter shall receive—in other words, that where a debtor and creditor account exists the debtor shall determine the amount due. When the rent is once fixed in this one-sided fashion, all the tenants have to pay the rent declared payable by them individually to the persons they appoint as receivers. They are on no account allowed to pay their several rents to the landlord. If the latter does not accept the rents and give receipts in full it is retained by the receiver

till he does so. In order to make it impossible that the rent shall be recovered by distraint the farms are stripped of their crops and the farm cattle sold or driven off, while the money paid to the receiver is employed in supporting the tenants till the landlord accedes to their demands. To sum up the above accurate account of the methods by which the Nationalist and Home Rule party have tried to make Ireland prosperous and the people contented:—They have set class against class, inflamed quarrels instead of appeasing them; have tried to reduce rents by arbitrary and unjust means; have interfered with the liberties both of landlords and tenants; have, by promoting agitation, made it impossible for capital to be employed in improvements with any hope of a safe return. They have impoverished tenants by stagnation of trade and the exactions made for party purposes far more than they have enriched them by reducing their rents. They have rendered all trust in contract impossible, by decreeing that it is for the debtor to determine what is due to the creditor. They have adopted odious and illegal means of enforcing their decrees, and while they denounce as coercion the laws recently passed to secure the punishment of those who execute these illegal decrees or incite others to do so, they have themselves tried to impose on the country one of the most hateful systems of coercion ever known.

I would now ask any impartial person how it is possible for Liberals or any politicians, except Anarchists, to maintain that a Home Rule Government, conducted by men who have so totally disregarded all the rules by which societies are bound together, can ever be anything else than a curse to the country. What reason have we to believe that men who have proved so reckless and unjust in the past will ever, when entrusted with the responsibilities of government, show themselves to be trustworthy statesmen? How can we suppose that those persons who now glory in their illegal practices will ever be careful to preserve law and order and just dealing between man and man? And how can those who wish for the prosperity of Ireland, and think it can be best secured by leaving the conduct of local affairs to Irishmen, think of the present Home Rulers except as the worst enemies of Home Rule and of Ireland? They may be, and I hope are, as we are told by their Liberal advocates, individually, excellent men; but, like many other ardent spirits, they are, as leaders, blind to the faults of their system, while they fix their eyes solely on the end they wish to attain. This, as the best among them believe, is the delivery of Ireland from the tyranny of the landlords. Till the Irish leaders learn to discard the means they have hitherto used to gain their ends, and till they try to unite all classes in the common object of improving the country and the people living in it, till they cease to agitate and disunite society, and till law and order is effectually maintained by the willing co-operation of the great majority of the people, things had much

better remain as they are than be made over to those who would make bad worse. The best that Liberals can hope is that the English Government will not relax its efforts to put an end to the illegalities of the National League, to bring about peace between landlords and tenants, to secure full consideration for all rights of both parties, and that if the landlords' rights are purchased by the tenants a fair price shall be paid for them. They will also wish to see measures taken to relieve the pressure of population in congested areas by giving the tenants better chances and more scope for their energies than they have at present, and the resources of the country developed by improving the fishing ports, establishing fishing as one of the chief national industries, making light railroads for the cheap transport of produce, dealing effectually with arterial drainage, and making such other improvements as may be found to be necessary and beneficial. A resolute persistence in such wise methods must in time bring about the union between classes, the preference of legal to illegal methods of redress, and of peace to fighting, which will make Home Rule a blessing instead of a curse to the country. We may then hope to see Ireland, not, as some Nationalists wish to make it, a petty Republic disunited from England, but one of the most active and thriving sections of the great English Imperial Federation, glorying in its own nationality, not in isolation from, but in union with, the other States of the Union.

Let us hope that we may then see Ireland not as it is now, the battle-ground of jarring factions, but a country in which all classes are united together to

Ring out a slowly dying cause
And ancient forms of party strife,
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

J. F. HEWITT.

[The following letter was written to Mr. Russell after perusal of his late article in THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, and some speeches, in which he made use of Mr. Webb's name in reference to the Curtin case. A few trifling verbal corrections have been made, which in no way alter the sense of the original.]

74 ABBEY STREET, DUBLIN,
June 6, 1888.

T. W. RUSSELL, ESQ., M.P.,
House of Commons, London.

DEAR SIR,—Upon several occasions lately you have used my name in connection with the murder of Mr. Curtin and the outrages on his family. You do not give a correct impression of my action and attitude. I have had to correspond with several people on the question. As I know you would not willingly misrepresent me, I write you the facts of the case, sure that whatever inferences you draw from them you will for the future state them correctly.

I returned to Dublin after a visit to the Curtins, horrified and disgusted at what I saw. The *Freeman* offered to put in anything I would write, and never withdrew from that offer. A regular meeting of the National League would be held in ten days. My intention was simply to publish a full account of what I saw. Most of my personal friends were in favour of this course. From the first, a near female relative, upon whose judgment I much rely in such matters, was clearly opposed thereto. My object was not to do what appeared heroic or dramatic, but what was really best for the Curtins and for suppressing such outrages in the future. She did not think my intended course would effect my object. Her view was strongly backed up by others, and what we finally arranged was this—that I should, at the house of one of the principal physicians in Dublin (a Protestant), who thought I should publish, meet a near relative (a Protestant), who also thought I should publish, and two of our friends who thought I should not publish; and that we should decide what was best under all the circumstances of the case. We met. I read my proposed communication. We talked the matter over for some hours, and we came unanimously to the conclusion that publication would neither serve the Curtins nor tend to stop outrage. At the next public meeting of the League I referred to the subject, said what I

had intended to do, and that I had altered my intention. And I let it plainly be seen what I thought of the way the Curtins were treated. Being "convinced" is not being "squared" or "silenced." I have never wavered in my belief that I acted for the best in coming to the conclusion I did. I wrote fully to the Curtins; we have been friends ever since, corresponding occasionally, and they called on me when in town. I subscribed to their fund and induced others to subscribe.

My experience in the conferences I had drew me nearer than ever to my friends of the Irish Parliamentary Party. I felt more than ever before how worthy they are of the confidence we repose in them, how sincerely anxious they are to put an end to outrage, and how imperatively necessary Home Rule is, if outrage is to be put an end to. I do not see eye to eye with them upon all occasions; but I believe history and future events will do them justice, as Earl Spencer, who has had better opportunities for judging than any other man in the world, has done them justice.

Since my visit the Curtins continued to suffer more or less up to the time of the compelled sale of their farm. I believe they would have suffered more if I had done the heroic. (You must not suppose that nothing was done.) They have been the victims of a vitiated and debased local public opinion, induced by ages of injustice and neglect. No matter how you, and many others, may believe that a better state of things might be brought about in the maintenance of your paper Union (a state of things in which Irish affairs would receive as complete, and entire, and prompt attention as English affairs), I believe the past has proved it to be an impossibility. *We are the true Unionists.* Dissension in Ireland, and bitterness between England and Ireland, will continue so long as it is attempted in a United Parliament to legislate regarding our internal affairs.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) ALFRED WEBB.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

PROFESSOR YOUNG's treatise on the Sun¹ in the International Scientific Series is an excellent summary of the scientific results arrived at in modern research. The author not only tells what is known, but discusses problems which need further investigation; and on this account the work is more than usually suggestive and interesting. The volume comprises nine chapters. The first treats of the distance and dimensions of the sun, and states the methods by which the results arrived at have been obtained. The apparatus is then described by which the surface of the sun is studied; and in the third chapter the different forms of spectroscopy and phenomena of the solar spectrum are explained. A description of the solar surface then succeeds, with drawings and photographs of sun-spots. The average duration of a sun-spot is stated at two or three months, though a spot lasted for eighteen months in 1840-1841. A spot, however, may be seen but a few hours. Spots may divide, and the parts repel each other at varying speeds. When a spot is completely formed it is approximately circular, but, as its end approaches, the surrounding photosphere seems to crowd in upon it. The evidence is clearly stated, which proves that the spots are hollows in the photosphere, which extend downward for from two to six thousand miles or more. The spots have furnished evidence that the sun rotates on its axis in about twenty-five days, but they also have a motion of their own, tending slightly towards the equator and to the poles, as well as moving in small ellipses. The periodicity of sun-spots occupies another chapter, and some attention is given to the question of their influence upon the earth in meteorology. Having stated the theoretical explanation of sun-spots, the author discusses the chromosphere and the solar prominences, which are illustrated by numerous figures. Ample illustration is also given of the corona as it has been represented by different observers. The author also discusses the sun's light and heat. Finally, a summary is given of the facts stated, and of the discussions founded upon them. An Appendix gives an account of Professor Langley's observations with the bolometer, and there are many notes which indicate the nature of researches made since the first edition of the book was printed. The volume is very carefully written, and is the work of a distinguished astronomer.

Professor Liversidge issues for the first time as a separate volume an

¹ "The Sun." By C. A. Young, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Astronomy in the College of New Jersey. With numerous Illustrations. Third Edition, with Supplementary Note. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1888.

account of the minerals of New South Wales,² which was printed in a less complete form by the Mining Department in 1882. The work is a mineralogical description, enriched with a large number of local details. It commences with gold, and extracts from contemporary newspapers interesting facts concerning the discovery of gold in the country. The results of numerous assays are given, which show the percentage of silver in the several samples and their value. Exceptionally there are minute quantities of iron, copper, and lead present, and even traces of bismuth. Silver is treated in the same way, and appended is a list of minerals in which silver and gold have been found. The value of gold from New South Wales declines steadily, and in 1886 was only £366,294. The value of silver, on the other hand, is augmenting, and in the same year amounted to £197,544. The amount of copper produced fluctuates greatly, and for the last few years the value of the yield has declined rapidly. A large part of the space devoted to each mineral is occupied with an enumeration of the localities in which it is found. The yield of lead is chiefly obtained from galena, and in 1886 was valued at £294,485. Iron is represented by the usual ores; but the value of the metal is comparatively small, and in the year to which all the latest statistics refer is only £19,000, whereas the tin raised in the same year had a value of £467,653. In addition to these minerals the rarer or less valuable substances which are known to occur in the colony are described. The second part of the volume, devoted to the non-metallic minerals, gives a short account of the diamonds and graphite, and a full account of the occurrence of coal and kerosene shale. The ordinary rock-forming minerals are described in this part, and descriptions and figures are given of some Australian meteorites. The volume concludes with a number of reprints of the author's papers communicated to the Royal Society of New South Wales. There are alphabetical lists of mineral localities, and an index of localities arranged under counties, as well as an alphabetical list of minerals. The volume includes a map, which indicates areas over which the chief mineral products of the country are distributed. The work is essentially technical, but appeals to all who are interested in the mineral wealth of New South Wales. It has been compiled with care, and gives a large amount of reliable information in the smallest space. It would have been an advantage had the work been more fully illustrated.

In a little pamphlet on asbestos,³ Mr. Jones brings together many interesting facts concerning this mineral substance. The different Canadian mines are described in a popular way, and some account is given of the uses to which asbestos has been applied. Too much is said in praise of asbestos mining.

The origin of the trees which are utilized or cultivated by man presents an aspect of evolution which is well calculated to engage the reader's interest from the abundance of materials for inquiry. And it was a happy idea of the Marquis de Saporta,⁴ to endeavour to trace the connections between familiar plants and the fossil remains preserved in the strata, which may stand to them in the relation of ancestors. What

² "The Minerals of New South Wales, &c." By A. Liversidge, M.A., F.R.S. With Map. London: Trübner & Co. 1888.

³ "Asbestos: its Production and Use. With some Account of the Asbestos Mines of Canada." By Robert H. Jones. London: Crosby Lockwood & Son. 1888.

⁴ "Origine, Paléontologie des Arbres cultivés ou utilisés par l'homme." Par le Marquis G. de Saporta, Correspondant de l'Institut. Avec 44 figures intercalées dans le texte. Paris: J. B. Baillière et Fils. 1888.

Gaudry has done for the surviving types of mammals, Saporta attempts for plants; and no living naturalist is better qualified by his researches on fossil floras to estimate the evidence concerning the descent of plants. In the Introduction the author describes the association and distribution of trees in forest regions, and sketches the relation which exists between types of vegetation found as fossils in various strata, and similar types which are living, though in different geographical areas. The mechanism by which he would account for the evolution of species and the succession of floras is of the simplest kind, being the refrigeration of the earth during geological time, and the consequent migration southward towards the tropics, of life which once existed at the pole, and to this refrigeration is attributed the origin of the deciduous condition of foliage. It must, however, be remembered that the refrigeration of the earth and the stability of the poles are both hypotheses, and that the study of invertebrate fossils lends no support to this contention of a progressive migration southward. The facts of plant evolution are, however, in no way dependant on this hypothesis, and are stated systematically under the ordinal types. The existing *Cycas revoluta*, which grows in the orange zone of the Mediterranean, appears to be a direct descendant of *Cycas Steenstrupii* from the middle chalk of Disco in Greenland. The *Salisburia* or *Ginkgo* has allies in the carboniferous rocks; but is a characteristic type in the lower secondary strata, and is found in newer deposits. The living form *S. biloba* has a collateral ancestor in Disco Island, and an immediate ancestor in the Miocene flora of Saghalien. The coniferous trees similarly show in contrasted figures the nature of the correspondence between fossil and living species of the same genera. The *Cedrus Leunieri*, from the lower chalk of Havre, is presumed to be the ancestor of the cedar of the Atlas; and examples are given which show the close correspondence between fossil species and the existing pines of Europe, while *Araucarias* dating back to jurassic deposits, are found in the Eocene strata of Europe, and thus show a succession of species in time. Among the yews, the existing *Cryptomeria* of Japan is paralleled by the fossil species from Antrim and Mull. Each of the great groups of plants is thus examined in detail, setting forth the descent of the palms, bananas, dracœnas, yuccas, bamboos. Among the dicotyledons, the author points out that types with simple persistent leaves preceded those with deciduous and deeply lobed leaves. The chestnuts preceded the oaks, and the interval between the types is covered by an intermediate series; and the palæontological history of plants abounds in examples of similar transitions. The history of every important ordinal type is thus traced, so as to make known for the first time to the general reader all those links of evidence which have weighed with many botanists and geologists in inducing them to believe in the progressive evolution and descent of plant life. The work is written with a masterly command of fact and perfect freedom from technicalities, and will be equally acceptable to the scientific man and the student, whose familiarity with the names of common plants enables him to appreciate the cumulative force of evidence reiterated through all grades of plant life.

In the preface to a book on the origin of floral structures,⁵ Mr. George Henslow gives a brief summary of views which have been advanced to

⁵ "The Origin of Floral Structures through Insect and other Agencies." By the Rev. George Henslow, M.A., F.L.S., F.G.S. With 88 Illustrations. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1888.

account for the phenomena to be discussed. He states that the idea occurred to him that insects might be the real cause of many peculiarities in the structure of flowers, and he regards his work as a revival of the ideas of Geoffroy St. Hilaire of 1795, and endeavours to refer every element in the structure of flowers to the influence of one or more conditions of their environment. The predominance given to the origin of species by insect agency distinguishes the present work from its predecessors, though his conception may be included under those which Mr. Darwin demonstrated in his experiments. The author insists on the large part which luck plays as compared with selection in determining whether the seeds germinate or bear fruit. Instead of supposing that plants are produced spontaneously, among which a few are more favoured by insects than the rest, the author reverses the process and regards the insects as the cause of the changes set up in the flower, and urges that, while the original species of insect induces the descendants of the plant to vary in adaptation to itself, other insects cause it to vary in other ways as soon as the seeds get transported. There are difficulties in accounting for the structures of flowers by natural selection, and the author is unable to see why the loss of three out of five carpels in the Labiates should go hand in hand with a multiplication of the ribs of the calyx, with the hooded corolla and lateral position of the flower, if this were due to natural selection, but he conceives that the irritations of tissues set up by the insect would lead to changes in growth sufficient to account for such phenomena. He would regard the survival of the fittest as due in the first place to constitutional selection rather than natural selection, giving as an illustration the fact that after planting a square yard of surface as thickly as possible with Rivett's wheat and the Russian Kubanka wheat closely mixed, all the grains germinated, but only twenty ears were produced, which were all of the Kubanka variety. With these and other views on the origin of flowers the author states his case. Having enumerated the general principles of variation in number, arrangement, cohesion, adhesion, and form which the organs of flowers manifest, each of these principles is discussed and illustrated in the earlier chapters so as to show something of the plans upon which flowers are formed. The forms of flowers are examined in some detail, and chapters are given to floral appendages, nectaries, sensitiveness of plant organs, laws of colour, development of floral whorls, and many other subjects connected with the reproduction of the species, the degeneracy of flowers, their metamorphosis and varieties of fertilization. Throughout the book, however, the botanical exposition predominates. We miss the experimental investigation which might have helped to sustain the author's views, and the work rather conveys the idea that the hypothesis of variation by the agencies mentioned has not been adequately put forward. It is easy to speculate, but the laborious digest of facts which make speculations an engine of research alone justifies their publication, and while the author's view is plausible and may even be a true cause in accounting for the phenomena, we think it would have been better not to have given it publicity, which invites criticism, until a larger array of evidence had been marshalled in support.

Mr. Edward A. Butler contributes an account of Silkworms to the Young Collector Series.⁶ The subject has the advantage over most previous

⁶ "The Young Collector. Silkworms." By E. A. Butler, B.A., B.Sc. London: Swan, Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1888.

works in the same series of dealing less with matters of classification and more with the life history of animals. This aspect alone should interest the young collector; he should train himself to observe, and observation can never be so systematically carried on as in following the details of structure and conditions of existence of a single animal type. The author traces the history of silk culture, but makes no mention of its existing manufacture in our own country. The next chapter details the life history of the silkworm, and by means of figures shows the stages of its growth and characteristic structures. The third chapter similarly illustrates and describes the internal anatomy of the animal. Then succeeds a practical chapter on the rearing and management of silkworms, and a chapter is given to diseases. The little book concludes with an account of wild silkworms, especially the oak silkworms of China and America.

The Young Collector's Handbook of British Birds⁷ is too ambitious. The Introduction gives but scanty information on the nomenclature of the feathers and the preparation of eggs. The five orders defined by habit are successively treated of; but the six pages given to the Raptores might more profitably have defined the essential characters and habits and varieties of raptorial birds. The author, instead of this, follows the analytical method, and briefly enumerates the birds, saying a few words on the habits, colour, and eggs of each, with occasionally a word or two on its geographical distribution. The same method is followed with the Insectores, Rasores, Grallatores, and Natatores. This method implies that the boy already knows the bird by its popular name, and he only learns its scientific name, and gets a few hints as to its habits and the recognition of its eggs. A list of British birds follows, with indications as to whether they are resident or visitors, or breed in the islands. The last thirty pages are an Appendix on collecting and preserving birds, by Mr. Bowdler Sharpe. This is an interesting article, but does little to justify its title, for it is only in the latter half of the paper that we are introduced to the mysteries of arsenical soap, and method of skinning and preparing the skins for preservation.

The Woolhope Naturalists' Field Club⁸ is well known for its influence on the cultivation of science, and among the many subjects which engaged the attention of the late Dr. Bull, the birds of Herefordshire were brought under notice of the members. The notes which he brought together, now issued in a volume, are almost entirely the result of observation on the habits and food of the various species, interspersed with many quotations from poets and prose writers who have referred to the several species. There is very little scientific description, but many facts of interest, such as an account of the way in which the ring-necked pheasant, introduced in 1802, has driven out the older species, are comprised in its pages. An Appendix gives the local names of birds in Herefordshire, and there is an Index of scientific and English names of the species. It is a useful piece of work, which, by its freedom from technicalities, will interest many lovers of nature beyond the limits of the county with which it is concerned.

⁷ "The Young Collector's Handbook of British Birds and their Nests and Eggs." By W. Harcourt-Bath. With a Chapter on Collecting and Preserving Birds by R. Bowdler Sharpe. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1888.

⁸ "Notes on the Birds of Herefordshire." Contributed by Members of the Woolhope Club. Collected and Arranged by Henry Graves Bull, M.D. London: Hamilton Adams & Co. Hereford: Jakeman & Carver. 1888.

"Flesh or Fruit"⁹ is an article reprinted from the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, strongly urging vegetarian diet. Arguments in this matter have probably but little influence in comparison with the qualities of taste and smell with which different individuals are endowed. For a long time it is probable that temperance in the use of animal food will prevail in preference to total abstinence, and although there is much to be said in favour of a preponderance of vegetable elements in the diet, it needs to be said so as to win sympathies by appealing to tangible advantages. The sentimental considerations which weigh with the author are never likely to influence the mass of mankind, whose first question is rather how they may survive in the struggle for existence.

Mr. Plumptre's "Natural Causation"¹⁰ does not appear to have any reason for his existence. The first article, the Doctrine of Design, viewed from the standpoint of evolution, does not even conceive of design, except in the old way, and it makes no effort to show that evolution is a form of design. The article is crude and does not carry conviction. The second paper—termed Philocephical Necessity: a Defence—is reprinted from the *Modern Review*, and is intended to support the views urged by Professor Clifford, of Necessity as opposed to Free Will. The third article is Natural Growth in Ethics, and attempts to follow out the idea that morality proceeds, as the author expresses it, like everything else in Nature, from inherent uniformity. The last paper, termed Natural Growth in Civilization, aims at showing that civilization is the effect of natural law. We have not succeeded in finding anything new in the book, but the papers are of that light kind which appeal to readers who readily dispense with originality.

The fifth annual issue of "The Year-book of Scientific and Learned Societies"¹¹ is this year divided into fifteen sections. The first comprises all those societies which occupy themselves with the different branches of science, or with science and literature. The succeeding divisions give particulars of societies which publish upon astronomy, mathematics, and physics; chemistry and photography; geography, geology, and mineralogy; biology, including horticulture, microscopy, and anthropology; economic science and statistics; mechanical science and architecture; naval and military science; agriculture, law, literature, and history; psychology, archaeology, medicine, and foreign societies. The volume concludes with an Index. Here will be found recorded not only particulars as to the officers and meetings of all the scientific societies in the British Islands, but the title and author of every scientific memoir published by those societies during the year. The list of foreign societies which is appended this year will be found useful for reference. We have noticed a few misprints in scientific names, but, on the whole, the work has been well done, and is an invaluable index to the literature of British science.

Mr. Sweet's laborious "History of English Sounds"¹² has the disad-

⁹ "Flesh or Fruit." An Essay on Food Reform. By H. S. Salt. London: William Reeves.

¹⁰ "Natural Causation. An Essay in Four Parts. By C. E. Plumptre. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1888.

¹¹ "Year-Book of the Scientific and Learned Societies of Great Britain and Ireland, comprising List of the Papers read during 1887, before Societies engaged in all Departments of Research, with the names of their Authors. With Appendix comprising a List of the Leading Scientific Societies throughout the World." Compiled from Official Sources. Fifth Annual Issue. London: Charles Griffin & Co. 1888.

¹² "A History of English Sounds from the Earliest Period, with full Word Lists." By Henry Sweet, M.A. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1888.

vantage of necessitating on the part of those to whom the subject is new a preliminary mastery of an extended system of signs in place of the familiar alphabet. But, having mastered the system of phonetics and the many questions concerned in sound-change, we pass through a short section, on the origin of speech-sounds, to the origin of dialects, in which the influence of rivers and mountains is estimated in dividing peoples, and the influence of temperature in relation to opening and closing the mouth is stated. The origin of writing is discussed under alphabets, new letters, and other elements of expression. Sections treat of Aryan sounds, Germanic sounds, Runes, old English sounds, Scandinavian sounds, middle English sounds, modern English sounds, and living English sounds. To this succeeds the first word list, which comprises the majority of words of old English or Scandinavian origin in common use, and a second word list of living old English. There is an index to the first word list, and tables of sound-change and forms of letters of dialect characteristics, and of contractions used in the book. It is a mine of information of the greatest interest, but technically expressed so as to appeal chiefly to the scientific student of language.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

M. DE MOLINARI has long and justly enjoyed an eminent position in France as a political economist. Two of the most recent of his many works claim our notice, although requiring a far more attentive examination than we can think of entering upon here. Both display their author's wide and accurate knowledge, not only of economic phenomena, but of history and sociology as well. Both are closely reasoned and full of suggestive thought. M. de Molinari belongs to the deductive or *à priori* school, and shares the tendency of its disciples to dwell, perhaps too exclusively, amid abstract principles. "*Les Lois Naturelles de l'Économie Politique*"¹ is a luminous and cautious re-statement of certain fundamental principles of human nature. These he calls the law of economy of force, the law of competition, and the law of the progression of values. M. de Molinari is in general extremely luminous. But we confess we are not quite sure that we comprehend what he means by the law of the progression of values. "*En vertu de cette loi,*" he says, "*la concurrence des quantités offertes au marché, en croissant ou décroissant en raison arithmétique, engendre une progression des valeurs décroissante ou croissante en raison géométrique.*" From which, he adds, it results that, on the one hand, the values of commodities tend to a level with the cost of their production, while, on the other hand, "a just and necessary equilibrium tends perpetually to establish itself in the production and distribution of riches." This, if we mistake not, is one of those "laws" to which many modern economists deny the name, contending that they are not founded on any unalterable order of Nature, but are simply gene-

¹ "*Les Lois Naturelles de l'Économie Politique.*" Par G. de Molinari. Paris: Librairie Guillaumin et Cie.

realizations from the actual working of certain human institutions, and, so far from being universal, are bounded by very narrow limits of time and space. The statement of these laws, and the proof of their necessity, however, occupies but a small portion of his work. He goes on to consider the causes which disturb their operation—obstacles arising from the nature of man and his environment. Then he traces the course of economic evolution, the various forms of competition—"animal," "political" and "industrial"—and the transformations from one to the other. Finally, we have a thoughtful sociological study of "*la servitude politique*," in which he makes many profound reflections on the functions of government, and the political and economical progress of society. In the appendices we find two remarkable papers on the civil war between capital and labour, and a project for mitigating it. The same author's larger and more important work—"La Morale Économique"—we must reserve for notice on some future occasion.

The second volume of the "*Petite Bibliothèque Économique Française et Étrangère*" is devoted to Bentham.² The design of the series is to present, in the most convenient form at a very moderate price, the principal works of the writers and statesmen who have advanced the science of political economy. The editor, M. Joseph Chailley, takes an unusually wide view of the limits of this science, so wide as to include Bentham's "*Principles of Legislation*," as well as his "*Manual of Political Economy*." Indeed we do not quite see why Bentham should have been selected as an economist at all. However, we are grateful for the volume. It is small enough to go into a very moderate-sized pocket, and it contains, besides the two works mentioned above, an excellent Introduction by Mdlle. Raffalovich, in which we find a *résumé* of Bentham's doctrine, along with an appreciative sketch of his life and principal writings.

No writer of mark is better acquainted with the affairs of South Africa outside Cape Colony than Mr. Rider Haggard, and no one has approached him in the power of exciting interest in the fortunes of the people of that troubled region. But it must be confessed that he has succeeded best when employing the attractive medium of fiction. For one who has read "*Cetywayo*"³ probably a thousand have read "*Jess*." He feels strongly, as we all know, on all that concerns the honour of England and the welfare of the English and subject black races of South Africa. Five years ago he published his views and experiences in "*Cetywayo; or, Remarks on Recent Events in Zululand, Natal, and the Transvaal*." A new edition being called for, he has re-issued it without alteration, but with the addition of an elaborate Introduction, wherein he summarizes the events that have occurred since 1882, and naturally takes the opportunity of pointing out the extent to which his earlier prophecies have been verified. The history is a sad and a shameful one. As regards Zululand and the sequel of Cetywayo's ill-judged restoration, Mr. Haggard's worst predictions have unfortunately been amply justified by the events which marked the disastrous paralysis of English influence under Lords Kimberley and Derby—events which illustrate once more the folly of the Colonial Office in disregarding the warnings of governors and other responsible men who are on the spot and acquainted with the people and

² "*Bentham : Principes de Législation et d'Économie Politique*." Par S. Raffalovich. Paris : Guillaumin et Cie.

³ "*Cetywayo and his White Neighbours; or, Remarks on Recent Events in Zululand, Natal, and the Transvaal*." By H. Rider Haggard. Second Edition. London : Tribner & Co. 1888.

the countries concerned. Mr. Haggard's epitaph on Cetywayo is only too true: "He was unfortunate in many things, but in nothing was he so unfortunate as in his friends and advisers." The wretched story of Boer aggression against gallant native races whom he thinks we were morally bound to protect, but for whom Lord Derby's dread of responsibility prevented a hand being raised, is told by our author with some bitter comments.

"*L'Enfer Parisien*"⁴ is the sensational title, hardly justified by the contents, of a series of light sketches in the by-ways of life in Paris, chiefly in the lower and less-known social strata. They are very brightly written. Very few of the scenes have anything savouring of "*l'Enfer*;" nor are the lives depicted those of the damned. We are taken behind the scenes, to places that most of us have never visited before. We are shown students, models, jockeys, opium dens, the curious uses and abuses of hypnotism, the asylums of the sick and poor, the horrors of the Morgue and the guillotine. But there is nothing hellish in it all.

Monsieur Tissot's winter in Vienna⁵ began with a visit to Venice, the much described; yet his crisp sentences and vivid recollections come with a certain freshness which pleases. From Venice he takes steamer to Trieste; and a visit to Miramar, the seat of the unfortunate Maximilian, gives rise to an interesting chapter on the short reign of the ill-fated archduke—a victim to Napoleonic intrigue, according to this Republican writer. From Trieste the author proceeds to Goritz, where he has the honour of an interview with the late Comte de Chambord. The journey to Vienna is enlivened by anecdotes of his fellow-travellers, stories of the country, &c., until Vienna is reached. He gives us a bright, kindly and detailed account of the Austrian capital and its society, and the Imperial family. We find nowhere a word that could wound national susceptibilities. Faults and failings are touched with a light hand. The book is full of humour and its interest never flags. Many Viennese traditions and stories are told in these pages—notably that of the "*Stock im Eisen*." We recommend to our readers Chapter XVII., on prisons and charitable institutions. M. Tissot gives a sad picture of the House of Detention, where murderers, thieves, drunkards, and minor offenders are all assembled together pell-mell, awaiting interrogation, in a place damp, gloomy, trickling with moisture, resembling the Catacombs. But the prison of the "*Landesgericht*," in the *Alservorstadt*, is a very different matter. Here sentences are worked out and executions take place. All is orderly, neat, and scrupulously clean. So extensive is this prison that three hours barely suffice to go over it. It is easy to see that the dreaded name of "Austrian Prison" is now a dead letter. So comfortable are the criminals made, and so generous is the menu, that many of them are no sooner released than they deliberately take steps to ensure their speedy re-admittance to this Paradise of criminals. The author was present at the execution of Hackler, an odious and heartless murderer. The grim scene is described with startling fidelity and illustrated by a wood-cut. But this gloomy subject is soon effaced by the bright pages which follow, and which describe pleasant, merry Vienna so faithfully. "*Alleweil fidel! fidel!*" is the cry of this careless, pleasure-loving people:—"Ce peuple sans

⁴ "*L'Enfer Parisien*." Par Hugues Le Roux. Paris: Victor Havard. 1888.

⁵ "*Un Hiver à Vienne*." Par Victor Tissot. E. Dentu, Editeur. Libraire de la Société des Gens de Lettres. Paris. 1888.

haine, sans envie, sans souci, philosophe à la manière du docteur Pangloss, a des mœurs si douces, il est si charmant dans ses relations, si ouvert et si hospitalier, qu'il lui sera certainement beaucoup pardonné pour avoir trop aimé la musique, la danse, l'amour, et la gaieté." The author has shown us Vienna. The book is illustrated by charming little wood-cuts, many of them quite delicious in their dainty precision.

There are very few spots on the continent of Europe, of which the world knows so little as it does of "the land beyond the forest."⁶ "No one ever comes to Transylvania in cold blood, unless it be some very rabid sportsman eager for the embrace of a shaggy bear." Hence the old world charm which, we are assured, hangs over it all—over its forests, its mountains, its mediæval church-fortresses, its ruined watch-towers, its mysterious caverns and gold mines, its songs, legends, costumes and customs. It is not easy to transfer this charm to the pages of a visitor's note-book. Yet Mrs. Gerard has almost succeeded in doing it, perhaps because she had no such object consciously before her. She tells us very distinctly what she has and has not aimed at. Her book is not historical, nor geographical, nor geological, nor sociological, nor yet is it a substitute for Baedeker. "All I have attempted here to do is to seize the general colour and atmosphere of the land, and to fix—as much for my own private satisfaction as for any other reason—certain impressions of people and places I should be loth to forget." Nevertheless, a good deal of history and other solid information has got woven in with the author's reminiscences, for, as she adds, she does not scorn serious information when it comes in her way, although she "takes more pleasure in chronicling fancies than facts, and superstitions rather than statistics." Still, superstitions are facts, and sometimes very instructive facts. Mrs. Gerard presents us with a perfect treasury of them. The three chief races inhabiting Transylvania are the Roumanian, Magyar, and Saxon, which we have named in order, according to their numbers. The Saxons were, the Magyars are, and the Roumanians will be, politically, the most important. They have all three very distinct and strongly marked characteristics, which Mrs. Gerard brings out very clearly. The Roumanians, who pride themselves on being the descendants of the Roman conquerors of the Dacians, stand to the Saxons and Magyars, we imagine, in something the same relation as the Irish peasants to their English and Scotch masters. The analogy seems tolerably close in several respects, but we have not space to work it out. The key to the Roumanian character is the Roumanian religion. "The whole life of a Wallack (the Saxon name for a Roumanian) is taken up in devising talismans against the devil." Far poorer and more ignorant than the Saxons, they are yet far more loveable, and of a far more refined ethnological type. But the sturdy, rough-out Saxon has his virtues too. His history is evidence of this. Seven centuries ago King Geisa II. invited colonists from Germany to settle in his thinly peopled territory; and from that day to this the German colonists have maintained themselves on the lands King Geisa gave their ancestors, preserving in a quite wonderful manner their national characteristics and the purity of their Saxon blood, living as more or less separate communities in the midst of Magyars and Roumanians. Our author's account of them is full of historical and antiquarian interest.

⁶ "The Land beyond the Forest: Facts, Figures, and Fancies from Transylvania." By E. Gerard. With Map and Illustrations. Two vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1898.

Indeed, there is hardly a page of these two spiritedly written volumes, which many readers will want to skip. There are a considerable number of well-chosen and fairly executed illustrations.

Sir Richard Temple has been bold enough to try the somewhat hazardous experiment of colouring his illustrations.⁷ The result is hardly encouraging. The colours are crude in the extreme. If one had never seen a good oil painting of an Eastern landscape, one might possibly find these illustrations some assistance in realizing the natural colour. But in our humble opinion they are bad art and can only do harm. Sir Richard may be a good painter, but if so there is something very wrong in the printing. He seems quite blind to the irony of the passages on colour that he quotes from Ruskin when read in connection with these illustrations. The object of the book is to present these reproductions of the author's studies in oils, illustrating the record of his tour in Palestine. The letter-press is subsidiary. It explains the subjects of the sketches, giving a *résumé* of the Scriptural events associated with each place, and adding any facts of general interest brought to light by recent explorations. It gives also a general account of the author's tour. The route lay between Jerusalem on the south, Jordan on the east, and Beyrout on the north. The fine roomy pages, the large clear print, and the wide margin make it a pleasure to read this rather ponderous volume—provided one can rest it on a table. We should not recommend it for a railway journey.

Mr. Holyoake⁸ reprints as a separate volume the series of papers originally contributed to the *Co-operative News*, describing a number of most interesting attempts made in different parts of England a century ago, with the object of benefiting the condition of the industrious poor, by giving them improved chances of bettering themselves. To Bishop Barrington, Count Rumford, and Sir Thomas Bernard he gives the credit of having "furnished the inspiration, the invention, and the advocacy of the remarkable devices of self-help promulgated at the end of the last century." Bishop Barrington was the first president of the "Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comfort of the Poor," a prototype, in some respects, of the Social Science Association of recent times. Sir Thomas Bernard was probably the originator of the idea of such a society, or at least he worked it out, and wrote or edited those "Reports" from which Mr. Holyoake has drawn most of his materials. Count Rumford invented, and recommended with great effect, a number of scientific and sanitary improvements in the public institutions of the time. Mr. Holyoake gives three accounts of "village shops"—the first of them at Mongewell, set up by Bishop Barrington—and he claims them as "co-operative stores." This is misleading. There was nothing co-operative about them. They were simply shops, established by philanthropic individuals on philanthropic not commercial principles, for the purpose of supplying to the poor of the village good articles at cost price (or as low as possible) for ready money. In one of the cases described by Mr. Holyoake, the shop was part of the vicarage, and belonged to the vicar. In another case, no family was allowed to deal with the "village shop," which appears to have belonged to the rector, unless some "adult member" of the family had attended church the previous Sunday. Mr. Holyoake has no difficulty in proving the

⁷ "Palestine Illustrated." By Sir Richard Temple. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1888.

⁸ "Self-Help a Hundred Years Ago." By George Jacob Holyoake. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1888.

valence at the epoch of which he treats of the most enlightened modern views as to the national duty and necessity of endeavouring to improve the condition of the poor in England, especially the agricultural poor. Nor was there any want of clear perception of the principles on which such attempts should be conducted. It would be interesting to inquire why these views were not more successful in getting themselves translated into action. Mr. Holyoake thinks it was the peace of 1815 that killed the movement. "The eminent persons whose devices" he records were, no doubt, actuated by pure human sympathy. But he thinks it was policy, not humanity, that brought them support. When policy no longer dictated encouragement of large and healthy families wherewith to supply the waste in our army and navy, interest in the poor died out. We know not if this explanation, little creditable to our upper and middle classes, be historically true. But, if it be, it shows how little the movement relied on self-help. Indeed, nothing is clearer from Mr. Holyoake's own pages than that the movement began and ended with the clergy, the gentry, and one or two manufacturers like Dale and Owen. The experiments related in detail by Mr. Holyoake are highly instructive, and give us many glimpses into the condition of rural England a century ago. Especially instructive and encouraging are the experiences of the Earl of Winchelsea and some other landowners, in granting to their labourers gardens, land for a cow, and so on, anticipating the modern movement for allotments and the "three acres and a cow" question. Even soup kitchens were not unknown in those days. Altogether most people will lay down Mr. Holyoake's instructive volume with much increased respect for the enlightenment of their great grandfathers, and some little shame at the discovery that a hundred years has seen so little strengthening of the social sentiment, and so little progress towards its realization in practice. "Little" we say, not "none"—as Mr. Holyoake's better known works abundantly prove.

Mr. Egmont Hake's solution of the unemployed problem⁹ is hardly of a kind to commend itself to the commercial community. Nor is the statement of the problem sufficiently full and systematic to be regarded as a scientific discussion of the relations of labour and capital. He contends that the world is not suffering from over production but from under consumption. This seems to us either trifling with terms or a neglect to estimate the international conditions which affect producer and consumer, and the problem is too large to be adequately stated in a paragraph. Secondly, he has much to say in praise of credit; in fact, the pamphlet seems written chiefly to commend Mr. O. E. Wesslau's Rational Banking v. Bank Monopoly. He is concerned at the fluctuation in value of coin as a medium of exchange, and, from the magnitude of clearing-house business, urges that credit is an indispensable condition of exchange wherever division of labour occurs. The indirect credit which constitutes banking is well known to be the only condition on which the bulk of our trade can be carried on; but the author is anxious that, while coin represents labour done, a working man should similarly represent labour to be done, so that his labour should become a medium of exchange. There is nothing novel in this proposal in so far as drawing bills on labour is concerned, the novelty is in the proposal to allow promises to use muscular power equivalent to a value in gold to circulate as a medium of exchange. To attain this end the author would establish free banking—in other words,

⁹ "The Unemployed Problem Solved." By A. Egmont Hake. London: Hatchards.

leave the banks free to issue notes on the Scotch system which existed before 1844. It is urged that the banker must select his customers from such producers as carry on business at a profit, and Mr. McLeod has urged that the influence of the free issue of notes in this way may be compared to the fertilizing effects of the waters of the Nile, because it is contended that in case of failure with a deposit bank it is the public who suffer, while under the author's proposal the bank would suffer. The weak points in this scheme are too manifest to require argument; but that a time may come with better education, when trades unions may take upon themselves the business of banking in relation to labour, and negotiate bills of credit for their members, would, perhaps, be a less chimerical anticipation.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

MR. CONNELL describes his little book on *The Irish Union*¹ as "a popular treatise on the leading features of Irish political history for the last two hundred years," and says it was written "for the enlightenment of those persons, especially thoughtful men among the working classes, who are conscious of their ignorance of Irish history." They must be very ignorant whom this jejune trifle enlightens on Irish history. It is a rather wearisome argument against the grant of Home Rule to Ireland, wherein some meagre and vague references are made to a few political events in Ireland. With its politics we have no concern: our function is to consider its worth as a popular historical treatise; but if its political value be no greater than its historical value, then the book is good paper spoiled. It does not merit a detailed examination of its faults and failures. We do not stay to point out the various errors due to carelessness, such as that Poyning's Act was passed in 1495, instead of 1494, and that the Irish Parliament was abolished in 1801, though most "thoughtful men among the working classes" know that it was abolished in 1800, and the Union dates from January 1, 1801. We confine our observations to one representative instance of Mr. Connell's method of writing "a popular treatise on the leading features of Irish political history." Every one will agree that amongst the foremost of such "features" must rank the parliamentary events in Ireland in 1782. Mr. Connell dismisses them in this crude sentence: "In 1782 the Irish Parliament was declared independent by the modification of Poyning's Act, and the repeal of Act 6, George I." What does the gentleman mean by "Act 6, George I."? Does he think there was only *one* Act passed in the sixth year of George I? Why did he not inquire, and then give the information, which he could easily have obtained, that it was 6 George I. cap. 5. But were they English or Irish Acts? How was Poyning's Act modified? and why was the 6 George I. cap. 5 repealed? The making of the Parliament independent of English control (and the change actually *made*

¹ "The Irish Union: Before and After." By A. K. Connell, M.A. London: Cassell & Co. 1888.

the Parliament independent, and was not confined, as Mr. Connell seems to think, to a mere declaration) was of sufficient importance to warrant the giving of some information concerning it in "a popular treatise" on "Irish political history." How, why, and by whom was it done? Mr. Connell does not say. Does he know? We doubt it. The book is void of historical merit.

In a comprehensive picture of Celtic Heathendom, Professor Rhys,² to the surprise, as he tells us in his modest preface, of his English friends, has found material not only sufficient for six lectures of an hour's length each, such as would satisfy the requirements of the Hibbert trust, but for a bulky volume not to be read in twice the time. Under such heads as the "Gaulish Pantheon," "The Zeus of the Insular Celts," "The Culture Hero," and the like, among learned theories, arguments, and inferences, the uninitiated might not expect to find a quantity of light reading and a number of racy stories; but such, in this case, is the fact. One example will do as well as another. It is taken from Irish legend, and tells how that "No lapdog had come into the land of Erin, and the Britons commanded that no lapdog should be given to a Gael on solicitation, or by free will, for gratitude or friendship. Now at this time the law among the Britons was, *Every criminal for his crime, such as breaks the law.* There was a beautiful lapdog in the possession of a friend of Cairbre Musc, in Britain, and Cairbre got it from him thus. Once as Cairbre went to his house, he was made welcome to everything save the lapdog. Cairbre Musc had a wonderful skene, around the haft whereof was adornment of silver and gold. It was a precious jewel. Cairbre put much grease about it, and rubbed fat meat to its haft, and afterwards left it before the dog till morning. The lapdog began and continued to gnaw the haft till morning, and hurt the knife so that it was not beautiful. On the morrow, Cairbre made great complaint of this, and was sorry for it, and demanded justice for it of his friend. 'This is fair, indeed; I will pay for the trespass,' said he. 'I will not take aught,' says Cairbre, 'save what is in the law of Britain, namely, *Every animal for his crime.*' The lapdog was therefore given to Cairbre." And the lapdog being then with young, and afterwards littering, "in this wise descends every lapdog in Ireland still."

Bibliographers and historians will value the two ponderous volumes on the Clinton-Cornwallis controversy,³ which have just been published by Mr. B. F. Stevens, who has collated and edited them. He has done his work wondrously well. The volumes are a marvel of painstaking labour, and the biographical notices in the copious index are worthy of especial praise. The historian now has, for the first time, the complete materials for determining the right direction of the blame for the catastrophe which terminated the disastrous campaign in Virginia in 1781. The origin of the controversy was on this wise. Sir Henry Clinton, who was made Commander-in-Chief of the British forces in America in May 1778, concentrated his forces at New York, and confined his military operations to predatory expeditions, which, though successful, were indecisive. Lord Cornwallis, the second in command, was dissatisfied with this desultory warfare, and urged his views so

² "The Hibbert Lectures, 1886. Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by Celtic Heathendom." By John Rhys. London: Williams & Norgate, 1888.

³ "Clinton-Cornwallis Controversy growing out of the Campaign in Virginia, 1781." Edited by B. F. Stevens. Two vols. London. 1888.

strongly that in 1780 Clinton was goaded into consenting to an invasion of the Southern Colonies. Charleston was taken, and then Clinton returned to New York, leaving Cornwallis in command of the invading forces. The next year Cornwallis marched northward into Virginia, planning for Clinton to emerge from the New York lines and meet him on the Chesapeake, with strength enough to enable them together to subdue the State. Clinton sent only a detachment, with which Cornwallis effected a junction, but, being still too weak to attempt anything of importance, he sat down in Yorktown, and prayed Clinton to come to his assistance, for Washington had quickly invested the place. Clinton waited, pondering the matter in secret, and finally concluding to do something, he set out from New York with 7000 men to relieve Cornwallis on October 19, 1781, and on that day Cornwallis surrendered himself, his army, and Yorktown, to General Washington. *Hinc illa lachrymæ!* Had the campaign been successful, the commanders would probably have squabbled over the rewards, and both claimed the glory of success; as it was a mean and miserable failure, they both energetically disclaimed responsibility for the campaign and its result, and each with venomous passion violently cast the blame on the other. As their swords could not save their reputations, they betook themselves to their pens for the purpose, and poured out their bitterness in a series of rancorous Narratives, Answers, Vindications, and Observations, only a little less mean and miserable than their military *fiasco*. The whole controversy is contained in these two volumes, which are peculiarly valuable, because they contain many important and hitherto unpublished manuscript notes, made by Sir Henry Clinton in copies of the pamphlets and in other books. The controversy seems to us to prove that, if Clinton was weak of purpose, hesitating, too phlegmatic, and dilatory, Cornwallis was too sanguine, rash, and hasty. Clinton sought safety, Cornwallis sought success. The opinion of the time leaned to the side of Cornwallis, who in 1786 was appointed Governor-General of India, in 1798 was made Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and in 1805 (just before his death) was appointed for the second time the Governor-General of India. Clinton got nothing till 1794, when he had to be content with the Governorship of Gibraltar. The general reader will probably say the controversy is of little interest to him, and will dismiss the whole matter with the not mistaken opinion that the commanders were partners in a losing game wherein both held bad cards, both had bad tempers, neither played up to the other, and, when the rubber was lost, flung the cards in each other's face. But the historian will perceive in these volumes matter which constitute a priceless contribution to the history of the American War in 1781.

Lieut.-General Showers' book, entitled "A Missing Chapter of the Indian Mutiny,"⁴ is an account of the author's service as Political Resident at the Meywar States during the period of the Indian Mutiny. It has been a "missing" chapter of the history of that calamitous mutiny, because the official reports of the Resident, which were forwarded to the then agent, Governor-General the late Sir George Lawrence, were lost in some unaccountable manner, and were, therefore, not included in the Blue Book presented to Parliament. Copies of those reports have recently been found, together with some original letters written by

⁴ "A Missing Chapter of the Indian Mutiny." By Lieut.-General C. L. Showers. London: Longmans & Co. 1888.

Lawrence. General Showers has performed a public duty in publishing this personal vindication. It was fortunate for Lawrence that the originals were missing, for he must have suffered in public esteem, if not from military condemnation, if documents such as those now published had been presented to Parliament. It is curious that their loss was never explained. It is unfortunate that the copies were not found before Lawrence died. He might have cleared his name from a grave suspicion of at least carelessness concerning documents which affected his good name, and by the loss of which he gained an advantage. General Showers appears to have had but scant justice—nay, scarcely justice—accorded to him in the apportionment of credit for the preservation of the allegiance to the English cause of the Maharana of Oodeypore, and the consequent maintenance of the English suzerainty over the Meywar States of Rajpútána during the Indian Mutiny, which it is now demonstrated was mainly due to the prescience and ready judgment of Lieut.-General, then Captain, C. L. Showers. The book is written in a well-restrained manner, but with a bright, clear, soldierly directness. It is interesting to the general reader, and invaluable to any future historian of the Indian Mutiny.

There is room for a short sketch of the history of Russia.⁵ There are one or two large and important histories of that empire in English, but the need of a brief summary of these histories has been long felt and often expressed. Mr. Shearwood has supplied that need in a cheap little book, which succinctly affords all the information upon the subject that most folk require to know. It is carefully and interestingly written.

Mons. G. Rothan in his last work, "*La Prusse et son Roi*,"⁶ has left his customary field of literary labour, wherein he has devoted himself to the sorrowful task of tracing from their origin the causes of the French diplomatic mishaps in 1866, and of their military disasters in 1870. In 1853, and during the period of the Crimean War, he was the second secretary of the French Legation at Berlin, and he now tells the story of Prussia's disgraceful diplomacy during that war. By permitting over thirty years to elapse between the events of which he has written and the writing of them, he has enabled himself to discover in the reflected light of later years the importance of many things which at the time seemed of little interest. The book is written in so lively a manner, and contains so many diverting passages, that the reader's attention never flags. The dolorous spectacle of Frederick William IV. at loggerheads with the many parties in his own kingdom, and irresolutely wavering in a dubious neutrality towards the contesting Powers, is painted in vivid colours. Weak, cowardly, and deceitful, the king scarcely troubled to inquire if his words harmonized with his deeds. Impatient and irresolute he angered and deceived everybody, including himself. A discussion with him led to nothing. "*Il écoute l'objection qu'on lui fait, en a l'air frappé, dit quelques mots d'approbation; puis, reprend son discours qui n'est qu'un long monologue avec lui-même et semble ignorer qu'on ne soit pas de son avis.*" M. de Bismarck had a poor opinion of his king, and asserted it in his peculiar fashion. When it was suggested that Prussia should plunge into the conflict "*à spolier ses voisins,*" he replied, "*il serait le*

⁵ "*A Short History of Russia.*" By J. A. Shearwood. London: Reeves & Turner. 1888.

⁶ "*La Prusse et son Roi pendant la Guerre de Crimée.*" Par G. Rothan. Paris: Armand Lévy. 1888.

premier à conseiller à son pays la politique d'aggrandissement, *s'il avait un autre souverain*, mais celui-ci ferait comme en 1849, il laisserait échapper tout ce qu'on lui mettrait dans les mains." Of Bismarck, who was then Prussian Minister at Frankfort, M. Rothan has much to say, and if sometimes he writes a little bitterly of the "intolerant man," he is not sparing in his admiration of him of whom Victor Cherbuliez said, "Jamais homme n'a plus écouté la raison, ni plus cédé aux passions." It is amusing to observe how often M. Rothan turns aside to extol the courtesy and grace of the French diplomatists, whilst he shudders at the recollection of the rudeness of the English. "L'Angleterre n'y allait pas de main morte; elle prenait le roi et son gouvernement brutalement à partie, sans tenir compte de leurs susceptibilités." One example is worthy of repetition here. The English Ambassador, Lord Bloomfield, complaining to the Prussian Minister, M. de Manteuffel, of the Prussian tendency to favour Russia, said, "Votre politique conduira la Prusse infailliblement à un complet isolement en Europe." *Manteuffel* replied, "Nous ne sommes pas aussi isolés que vous le croyez." "Vous avez raison," said Bloomfield, "*j'oubliais que vous étiez les satellites des Russes*" Yet, to England's energetic disregard of his susceptibilities, Frederick William was indebted for the éclat which he gained by bringing about the peace. England bluntly asserted she would no longer endure his tergiversations. He must declare for the Allies, or she would blockade Prussia in the Baltic, and teach her a lesson she would never forget. The king was electrified into action, wrote his memorable letter to the Emperor Alexander, and ordered his Ambassador to withdraw from St. Petersburg if Russia rejected the preliminaries of peace formulated by Austria. Alexander made this letter a pretext for accepting those conditions, and Prussia's timid king by this one act of terrified vigour rehabilitated his country in the eyes of Europe. M. Renan has truly said, "L'histoire est tout le contraire de la vertu récompensée." The laws of history are often impenetrable, and the reader of M. Rothan's work will close it with the opinion that Prussia's career is a striking proof that the faults which ought to destroy States do surprisingly turn to their advantage, and are even found to be the starting points of their future grandeur.

In the writing of personal reminiscences, the French excel the English. They write with so much verve, with such gaiety of spirit and daintiness of touch, that the brightest of our English autobiographies seem heavy and too severely solid when compared with French "*souvenirs*." A most admirable example of the best French "*souvenirs*," is to be found in the four volumes of "*Soixante Ans de Souvenirs*,"⁷ by Ernest Legouvé. Legouvé is a name well-known in French literature, and was so in the year 1813, when Ernest Legouvé, a child but six years old, went with his grandparents to L'Académie to listen to the eulogies passed upon his father by M. Alexandre Duval, who had succeeded him as member of the Academy. From that day, the son's fixed purpose was to emulate the success of his father in literature, and it is with a pardonable pride that he dwells upon the faithful copy of his father's career, that his has been. "Il était membre de l'Académie, je le suis. Il était professeur au Collège de France, je l'ai été. Il a eu des succès éclatants au Théâtre-Français, j'y ai été applaudi." But nothing that the author of

⁷ "*Soixante Ans de Souvenirs*." Par Ernest Legouvé. Four vols. Paris: J. Hetzel et Cie. 1888.

"Médée," and of "Nos Filles et nos Fils," has written equals in beauty of language and charm of style these most enchanting volumes. They constitute a great prose epic, in which the writer has immortalized his life, his genius, and his friends. Yes, his friends owe him a great debt of gratitude, the living and the descendants of the departed dead, for he has given all of whom he has written another life in enduring form, with all the graceful appearance that genius could supply, and with all the exactitude that truth and generosity permitted. The work is something more than an autobiography; it is a history—a picturesque history of eminent persons who have lived in the years from 1813 to 1876. It is in 1876 that the work ceases. We sincerely trust that the "souvenirs" of the later years, which we are told are being written, will be published. M. Legouvé gives no promise to publish them. The prospect of their publication would in itself make life worth living in order to read them, that the pleasure might be renewed which we have had in reading the "Soixante Ans de Souvenirs."

In his "Trente Ans de Paris"⁸ M. Alphonse Daudet chats, in his usual pleasant, easy style, of himself and his acquaintances, ranging over a period which commences, at the age of sixteen, with his journey to Paris from his parental home in the far south, in a third-class carriage, in light summer clothes, although it was winter, and starving for forty-eight hours rather than break in on his precious fortune of forty sous. How his brother, a few years older than himself, met him and took care of him, and how they both lived on his brother's salary of seventy-five francs a month; what hope and despair he experienced, and what adventures he met with in his early endeavours to establish himself as a writer, are briefly touched on with a graceful mixture of humour and pathos. He has a great deal that is interesting to tell us of the famous men he has at one time or other been intimate with. Several of them were student friends, and, like himself, endeavouring to cut their way to fame and fortune with pen or brush. Gambetta and Rochefort were among the number. For Rochefort he appears to have at once conceived a high admiration, if not affection, and he devotes a whole long chapter to reminiscences of his early friend. Tourgenieff, whom he met at a later period, is similarly honoured. These brief, sketchy memoirs cannot fail to be appreciated by all who mixed in Parisian literary circles under the second Empire. They are fascinating even to us who know the actors in those times only by name. All who have laughed over his inimitable "Tartarin de Tarascon" will be pleased to read the author's "history" of that and several of his other books, which he gives in the present volume at considerable length. We must not omit to mention the illustrations—a vast number of little photo-engraved vignettes—some very spirited, some deliciously delicate.

Yet another book about Shelley!⁹ This time it is a monograph, by Mr. H. S. Salt, who tells us he has written it "with the desire of exhibiting the opinions and actions of the poet as they appear to a sympathetic observer." He would have more accurately described himself if he had written instead of "a sympathetic observer," the words "an indiscreet and uncompromising devotee." He has not hesitated to exemplify an old and well-known adage, and has rushed in with blustering adulation

⁸ "Trente Ans de Paris : à travers ma vie et mes livres." Par Alphonse Daudet. Illustré par Bieler, Montégut, Myrbach, Picard et Rossi. Paris: Marpon et Flammarion. 1888

⁹ "Percy Bysshe Shelley." By H. S. Salt. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1888.

where others have feared to tread. Other writers about Shelley have justly found something to be blamed or excused in the life of the poet, and have discreetly sought to veil the offensive matter rather than grub amongst it with gross minds and grunts of satisfaction. Mr. Salt has taken the latter course. He daringly calls for the public praise of that which the moderately pure mind of the public has hitherto, because it possessed some purity, unhesitatingly condemned. He demands that Shelley shall be judged "by his own standard of morality, and not by that which it was his special object to discredit and overthrow." Mr. Salt leaves the reader in no doubt as to what he thinks, or what he wishes the reader to think, was Shelley's "standard of morality." He says Shelley "belonged to that not inconsiderable class of social heretics who see in the marriage bond nothing more than a conventional institution, devoid alike of moral sanctity and true utility." And we are asked to believe that the "special object" of the poet, his "sacred and indispensable mission," was to discredit orthodox morality and overthrow the "ephemeral custom" of marriage, and to believe that when "the next period of social and moral evolution" has been reached, Shelley will be glorified and adored in respect of those incidents in his life, and those passages in his works, which in these days are blamed or passed by in silence. There is a lot of rubbish of that sort in the book, the splutterings of a rather clever but immature and ill-regulated mind. It is difficult to determine whether the work is the result of a coarse, fanatical zeal for the worship of an idol which the writer, least of all men, understands, or whether it is an impudent endeavour to gain the notoriety of a social iconoclast amongst "social heretics" with immoral tendencies and depraved desires.

The author of "*Römische Schlendertage*"¹⁰ is of opinion that a man must have peculiar courage to write anything about the Imperial city, and disclaims the intention of contributing anything new, or suggesting any new point of view on the subject of Rome. The book is mainly a rhapsodical record of the pleasant days which Herr Allmers once spent in Rome, but some of his poems are interspersed through the volume. Amongst them we find one entitled, "*Beim Sterbenden Fechter.*" It consists of two stanzas, and the second is as follows:—

"Er sieht nicht mehr des Circus wilden Kampf
Er hort nicht mehr der Menge Beifalls brullen
Still schaut sein brechend' Aug' auf seine Wände—
Wie jah sie klafft und wie es quillt und quillt
Das warme Blut, so voll, so purpur roth
Auch an die Heimath, an die fernern Lieben
An's treue Weib, an seinen pracht'gen Jungen
Denkt er voll Weh mit nacht umflortem Sinn—
Eine Minute noch—der Arm lasst nach—
Er ist vorbei! Schlaf sinkt der Lieb zur Erde
Und heimwärts fliegt der Geist. Wohl dir, du Armer!
Dass ist voruber! Schande dir, O Rom!"

It is hard to read the above lines without suspecting that the poet was more indebted to his recollection of "*Childe Harold*" than to his own imagination. The volume is well printed, and, after making allowances for the extravagant language in which Rome is referred to, many readers may enjoy the book.

¹⁰ "*Römische Schlendertage.*" Von Hermann Allmers. Oldenburg and Leipzig: A. Schwartz.

BELLES LÉTTRES.

"POEMS,"¹ by Stopford A. Brooke, are well worth reading. They express the sentiments and emotions of a refined and cultivated nature, and they express them in clear and melodious verse. No painful effort is needed to unravel obscurities of style, or to perceive the drift of vague or misty sentiment, but each poem is the embodiment of a distinct thought, or conveys a clear image of some distinct event or person. Moreover, in spite of a vein of melancholy, the poet for the most part indulges a "genial mood," and we are happily excused from a needless familiarity with whatsoever things are repulsive, and whatsoever things are of ill report. The longest poem, "Six Days," is the record of a lover's holiday in an enchanted country of woodland and moorland, of mountain and sea, the different aspects of which suggest a poem for each day. Both narrative and songs are full of beauty, and the whole poem should give delight, but we cannot escape from the conclusion that the inspiration is not of the Muse herself, but of great contemporaries. Take the following lines:—

"She went alone, and near a rocky stream
That through twelve silver birches, fluttering gold,
Ran tawny-topaz, found the solitude
That lovers long desire."

Or again:—

"She sang that night. Musician to the tips
Of her fine fingers, and interpreting
With reverence her music, she was touched
From note to note with momentary moods
Of her own nature, so that he that heard,
Not only loved the music, but her heart"

Or take the following:—

"But I, who knew the old man would delay
Among his ferneries a long-spun hour,
And claim his daughter for himself alone,
Ran up the mountain's side and climbed along
A flanking dyke, which rose aslant and steep,
Ridged like a dragon's back with rocky horns."

The lines are excellent lines, but to all intents and purposes they are Lord Tennyson's and not Mr. Stopford Brooke's. In the shorter pieces, however, many of which are full of quaint and tender fancies, there is a strain of original verse. Of these we read with especial pleasure, "The Jungfrau's Cry," "Stockhorn and the Valley," "Memory," and "A Quiet Stream." Perhaps in "Endymion" and "Hylas"—where, however, there are reminiscences of Matthew Arnold—Mr. Brooke reaches his highest level. No apology is needed for the publication of so charming a collection of poems, but while they prove the author to be the happy possessor of a poetical imagination and a refined literary taste, they will hardly exclude him from the assembly of those who are almost poets.

Three essays by Dean Church, on Dante,² Wordsworth, and Mr.

¹ "Poems." By Stopford A. Brooke. London & New York: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

² "Dante, and other Essays." By R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

Browning's "Sordello," are reprints of articles which are well known and justly valued for their delicacy of appreciation, for their sympathy and their insight. The style and tone of the essays remind us not a little of the poetical stories of Mr. Aubrey de Vere, which we noticed in the June number of the *WESTMINSTER REVIEW*. In the long and interesting study on Danto we were especially struck with the Dean's claim for the "Commedia" as the first of a long series of confessions or self-revelations in which poets have manifested to the world the working of their own souls, and so raised the world to their own level. "It is common enough now," he says, "for the poet, in the faith of human sympathy, and in the sense of the unexhausted vastness of his mysterious subject, to believe that his fellows will not see without interest and profit glimpses of his own path and fortunes. . . . But it was a new path then; and he needed to be, and was, a bold man, who first opened it—a path never trod without peril, usually with loss or failure." The essay on "Sordello" is of the nature of a key, and will be of value alike to the faithful and the curious.

"The Land of Gold, and other Poems,"³ by Mr. George R. Sims, treats as usual of sensational incident in the lives of the poor and suffering. His verse is spirited and rhythmical, and the appeal to our sympathies, however much we may be inclined to resist at first, in the end invariably succeeds. We come to mock and we remain to gulp. Perhaps "The Parson's Fight" harassed our feelings most satisfactorily, while "An Old Actor's Story" goes almost too far in the direction of the improbable. Mr. Sims should keep to the rules and fight fair, and he may continue to make us all cry for years to come.

"Raygarth's Gladys, and other Poems,"⁴ by James Saunders, unites considerable ingenuity of fancy with some facility of expression. A variety of subjects, treated in widely divergent styles, leads us to suspect that the writer possesses literary interests rather than literary skill, and that he has yet to learn the limits of his own powers. But here and there, as in "The Doctor and the Child" and, "Prue's Escape," the author succeeds in striking a note that is neither borrowed from other tunes nor is unpleasing in itself.

"A Companion to 'In Memoriam,'"⁵ by Elizabeth Rachel Chapman, is a prose version or analysis of the Laureate's great elegy. If it is well to compose such a work at all, the little work deserves favourable notice. But is it well? The picture of a dull but painstaking reader, baffled by Lord Tennyson's obscure Muse, and having recourse to Miss Chapman's "Companion" by way of a "crib," is just a little ludicrous. Indeed, we question if the poet's diviner message can ever be conveyed by means of an interpreter. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

We can do no more than acknowledge "Poems of the Plains,"⁶ by Thomas Brewer Peacock; and "Selection from the Prose of Seneca,"⁷ edited by Walter Clode.

³ "The Land of Gold, and other Poems." By George R. Sims. London · S. P. Fuller. 1888.

⁴ "Raygarth's Gladys, and other Poems" By James Saunders. London · Thomas Laurie. 1888.

⁵ "A Companion to 'In Memoriam.'" By Elizabeth Rachel Chapman London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

⁶ "Poems of the Plains." By Thomas Brewer Peacock, New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1888.

⁷ "The Morals of Seneca: a Selection of his Prose." Edited by Walter Clode. London: Walter Scott. 1888.

We have much pleasure in acknowledging Mr. Ainger's edition of "The Letters of Charles Lamb."⁸ The editor has done his work admirably. His is certainly the best edition of these most interesting letters that has hitherto been published. Not only is the series brought nearer to completeness by the addition of many important letters now printed for the first time, but great pains have been taken to ascertain, approximatively at least, the date at which each letter was written—a matter of considerable difficulty, owing to Lamb's inveterate habit of leaving his letters undated. As arranged by Mr. Ainger, the letters, as the Introduction truly asserts, form, when read consecutively, an almost complete biography. They begin with the letters to Coleridge, the first of which is dated May 1796, when Lamb was but one-and-twenty, and are continued to within a few days of his death, the last letter—to Mrs. Dyer—bearing the date of December 22, 1834. The explanatory notes, at the end of the second volume, are just what they should be—sufficiently full without being lengthy.

The last volume which has reached us of Messrs. Vizetelly's excellent "Mermaid Series"⁹ contains the four comedies which constitute the whole *Théâtre* of Wycherley: "Love in a Wood; or, St. James's Park;" "The Gentleman Dancing Master;" "The Country Wife;" and "The Plain Dealer." The Introduction, by Mr. W. C. Ward, is an admirable piece of criticism—just without severity, and appreciative without undue laudation. So much cannot be said for Macaulay's critical and biographical notice of Wycherley, which immediately precedes the plays. Its tone is rigid, and even puritanical; there is no light and shade, no discrimination. It is not so much criticism as denunciation. If Wycherley, as a man, had been what Lord Macaulay paints him, he would hardly have enjoyed the esteem and lifelong friendship of Dryden and Pope; and if his merit as a dramatist was so inconsiderable, he was scarcely worth criticizing. The truth is, that Macaulay was by no means exempt from the *Tartufferie Anglaise*, and Wycherley's freedom of speech and laxity of morals in the relations of the sexes were such an offence to him that he became unjust and bitter. Perhaps the truest view of the light-hearted profligacy of the Restoration dramatists was that taken by Charles Lamb. He says somewhere that they were not so much immoral as nonmoral; that theirs was a fictive and unreal world in which virtue and vice had no place.

The volume of "Miscellaneous Essays,"¹⁰ which has been sent to us for review, is the first of a series, to be published in monthly instalments, containing the collected miscellaneous writing of the Very Rev. the Dean of St. Paul's. The opening volume consists of "The Essays of Montaigne," "Brittany," "Cassiodorus," "The Letters of Pope Gregory I.," and "The Early Ottomans." The essays, as might be anticipated, are marked by much literary ability, and give evidence of considerable research. Some of them have, perhaps, for secular-minded readers, rather too much of an ecclesiastical turn of thought, and some—notably, the essay on "Brittany," written in 1846—may be a little out of date. Great changes have taken place in the manners of the Breton

⁸ "The Letters of Charles Lamb." Newly arranged, with additions. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Alfred Ainger. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

⁹ "The Mermaid Series." Edited by Havelock Ellis. "William Wycherley." Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by W. C. Ward. London: Vizetelly. 1888.

¹⁰ "Miscellaneous Essays." By R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

peasantry in the course of the last forty years; they are becoming *francisés*, and a "Breton bretonnant" is now a comparative rarity. The ancient language is falling into disuse, and many of the old national sentiments, beliefs, and customs are dying out with it. But neither of these objections can be urged against the essay on Montaigne—a purely literary essay, where *l'actualité* has no part, and where religious bias is not prominently displayed. It seems to us, in all respects, an admirable piece of work. The essay on "The Early Ottomans" is, however, to our mind, the most interesting in the volume; it throws light on a somewhat obscure corner of history. The picture given by Dean Church of the feeble yet pretentious Emperors of the East, in the dark inglorious days which preceded the fall of the Empire, recalls to us a very similar picture in a curious old Spanish book, which we chanced to read many years ago; it was entitled, "Guerras de Catalanes y Aragoneses contra Turcos y Griegos." We know not whether a copy of it is still procurable.

Mr. Hardy's "Wessex Tales"¹¹ have the fine quality, the piquancy, and above all the undefinable personal charm, that characterize all his writings. His stories have an atmosphere of their own; they transport you into a world removed alike from the weary work-a-day world we live in, and from the conventional world of fiction. It is a world homely and rugged, but never commonplace; intensely real, yet highly idyllic and poetical. For readers whose ideal of entertaining fiction is a graphic representation of the society they themselves frequent, Mr. Hardy's novels have probably little charm; but to those who care for vivid pictures of rustic life, and the powerful presentation of unfamiliar types of humanity, few contemporary romance writers are so fascinating as the author of "The Woodlanders."

We do not think that the reputation of the late Captain Mayne Reid as a novelist is likely to receive additional lustre from the posthumous publication of "The Child Wife."¹² It deals with a totally different class of subjects from those previously treated by him, and it does not deal with them skilfully, fairly, or pleasantly. We are accustomed to receive from his pen stirring tales of adventure in the prairies, sensational combats with Indians or Spanish Creoles, hair-breadth escapes, and impossible rides on untamed "mustangs." But now he reveals himself as the stern, fanatical revolutionist, the ardent and aggressively militant Republican. His hero would be, like "Brutus" (one of Mr. Toole's early impersonations), "the terror of kings," but that all his plots end in smoke, and he himself ends by marrying the daughter and heiress of a rich English country gentleman. There is absolutely nothing to remind one of the Mayne Reid of old, except the slapdash inaccuracy of his style, his unmeasured boldness of statement, and his light-hearted confidence in describing things with which he has but a distant acquaintance. As, for instance, when, in depicting English country-house life, he makes pheasant-shooting precede partridge-shooting, and represents fox-hunting as in full swing at the beginning of October.

"Peccavi"¹³ is a very readable novel; decidedly above the average in

¹¹ "Wessex Tales: Strange, Lively, and Commonplace." By Thomas Hardy, Author of "The Woodlanders," &c. In two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

¹² "The Child Wife." By the late Captain Mayne Reid. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1888.

¹³ "Peccavi." A Novel. By Emily F. D. Osborn. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1888.

literary style, and not below it in interest of plot or delineation of character. Both the hero and heroine, if such terms may be applied to young persons by no means heroic, make ill-considered and disastrous marriages, and have, though from different causes, ample reason to cry "Peccavi." The one is rescued from the degradation and misery into which his own rashness and weakness had plunged him, by the unexpected, and, we must add, improbable, relenting of a crabbed old uncle; but the heroine pays for her headstrong infatuation with her life.

"The Fat of the Land"¹⁴ is a difficult book to review justly. It has great defects which cannot be passed over, and yet, on the whole, it is a book of considerable merit. It is by no means well written—in the narrative portions especially, for many of the conversations are excellent; and then it is much too long. Not only is it needlessly diffuse and circumstantial, but there are constant digressions, which, if not actually irrelevant, do little or nothing to advance the story. And yet in these erratic passages some of the best things in the book are to be found. For instance, there is an anecdote of the late Duke of Wellington, which, if it be not true, is assuredly *ben trovato*. An inventor had brought the Duke a model of a wonderful cinder-sifting machine, and, after shortly explaining its working, begged him to patronize the invention. The Duke's answer was: "I'll take one of your machines, because you've had the sense to show me the model, instead of bothering me with long-winded talk; but I beg you to observe that, if ever the thing is to be of the slightest use to me, *I must use it myself*." Several of the characters are evidently drawn from the life, and are very amusing; indeed, the picture of the Hon. Colonel Leppell and his family is sufficient of itself to raise the book above mediocrity. Cathedral society is amusingly satirized too—evidently the author knows it well. And besides all this, the general tone of thought is marked with sound sense and good feeling.

In "Herr Paulus"¹⁵ Mr. Besant introduces us into the world of mesmerists, spiritualists, esoteric Buddhists, theosophists, *et hoc genus omne*. He demonstrates clearly that the sole germ of truth contained in the vast mass of imposture lies in mesmerism, which is a solid fact, whose importance has not yet been sufficiently investigated. "Herr Paulus" is an impostor of no common type. He is a young American of extraordinary quickness of perception, highly nervous and imaginative temperament, and—*ce qui ne gâte rien*—of almost superhuman personal beauty. He strikes out a new line for himself; he derives his inspiration, not from the "Mahatmas" of Thibet, or the occult philosophers of St. Petersburg—both beginning, as he perceives, to be played out—but from the Abyssinian sage, Izäk Ibn Menelek, the direct descendant of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. He it is who has initiated "Herr Paulus" (*né* Ziphion B. Trinder, son of a storekeeper in an obscure New England town) in the mysteries of the new faith, named by Paulus, its inventor, "The Ancient Way." We will not follow his career; it is shadowed forth sufficiently in the title-page. We would rather dwell on the charm and *verve* with which his story is told by Mr. Besant. Other men can instruct, can interest, and can touch; of these last, too many make it their chief aim to sadden. But Mr. Walter Besant is, to our thinking, peerless, among contemporary English novelists, in the power of amusing

¹⁴ "The Fat of the Land." A Novel. By Mary Lester (Maria Soltera). London: Blackwood & Sons. 1888.

¹⁵ "Herr Paulus: His Rise, His Greatness, and His Fall." By Walter Besant. London: Chatto & Windus. 1888.

and delighting. He too instructs—his words of wisdom are not few. He too can touch the hearts of his readers ; but at the same time he cheers and soothes. His books never sadden.

M. André Theuriot's new romance, "*Amour d'Automne*,"¹⁶ is, in its way, quite as forcible an exemplification of the evils and misery resulting from irregular sexual attachments as M. Alphonse Daudet's "*Sapho*." But here the mischief is wrought, not, as in "*Sapho*," by a vulgar *collage*, but by a *liaison* of long standing with a married woman of good position and unblemished reputation. It is a painful story, and made still more poignant by the pathetic touches which few writers can lay on with the skill and delicacy of M. Theuriot. But still, the perfection of the style, the poetic charm of the descriptions of scenery—the whole of the action takes place amongst the lakes and mountains of Savoy—the force and truthfulness of the characterization, combine to make "*Amour d'Automne*" delightful, though, it must be confessed, somewhat melancholy reading.

"*L'Abbé Jules*"¹⁷ is a strange book ; extraordinarily powerful in its analysis of a most complex and discordant nature. Jules Dervelle may be briefly described as a victim to insane neurosis. As he himself is made to say in his last days, his life had been a failure because he had never been able completely to conquer the passions that were in him ; the repressed passions of the priest, and the inherited passions born of the mysticism of his mother and of the alcoholism of his father. Two natures were constantly at war within him, and their fierce struggle tormented and rent him, just as those poor wretches were rent who were supposed of old to be possessed by devils. Unhappily, it was the evil nature that, for the most part, had the upper hand, driving him, from his youth up, into mad accessions of rage, unreasoning, universal malevolence, and fits of frantic lust. Yet the miserable man had a great intellect, noble aspirations, an inborn hatred of baseness, hypocrisy, and false pretence, and now and again gleams of loving-kindness, of tender compassion for suffering, and of humble self-abasement before real goodness or greatness. His character is, for the most part, revolting, but, at times, little short of sublime. Its exposition by M. Mirbeau is an artistic effort of a very high order triumphantly accomplished.

Any work signed by M. Georges Ohnet¹⁸ is sure to rank very high in contemporary fiction ; but there are necessarily inequalities even in writers greater than he, and we cannot honestly say that in "*Volonté*" he is seen at his best. To say that it is not equal to "*Serge Panine*" is little, for it was hardly probable that in any subsequent effort he would touch such supreme success. But "*Volonté*" does not seem to us to be equal to "*Le Maître de Forges* ;" it certainly cannot compete in interest with "*La Grande Marnière*." A great deal of the first part is more or less dull, and the two personages—male and female—who illustrate "*Volonté*" are, we cannot help thinking, somewhat exaggerated and overdrawn. "*Clément de Thauziat*" has a tendency to be melodramatic ; he has too much of the "*Admirable Crichton*," with a touch of the dark fatefulness and wicked dangerousness that used to characterize Bulwer's heroes. In short, he has more than a trace of tinsel about him. "*Hélène de Graville*"

¹⁶ "*Amour d'Automne*." By André Theuriot. Paris: Alphonse Lemerro, 1888.

¹⁷ "*L'Abbé Jules*." By Octave Mirbeau. Paris: Paul Ollendorf, Editeur. 1888.

¹⁸ "*Les Batailles de la Vie, Volonté*." Par Georges Ohnet. Paris: Paul Ollendorf, Editeur. 1888.

is too good to be true—too uniformly wise and excellent and self-sufficing. Both are, in their several ways, examples of the moral quality of Will, rather than living, breathing human creatures. Then there are other characters so utterly weak and infirm of purpose that it is evident they only exist as foils for the hero and heroine, and to cut out work for them. But, in the second half of the volume, M. Ohnet's great gifts as a romance writer shine forth. Both hero and heroine become more individual and more human, and the powerful and touching *dénouement*, skillfully brought about, goes far to redeem any imperfections in the earlier part of the story.

We have the pleasure to acknowledge vol. iii. of "The Henry Irving Shakespeare,"¹⁹ We shall, as we have already intimated, reserve our notice until the completion of the work.

We have received "The Counting-out Rhymes of Children,"²⁰ by Mr. H. C. Bolton. The subject is not without interest as a minor branch of folk-lore; but we do not think the author has treated it in a truly scientific spirit.

We have also received the following works which, from want of space, we can do no more than acknowledge:—"A More Excellent Way," by Constance Howell. London: Swan Sonnenschein. 1888. From "The Camelot Series," "Select Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson," with an Introduction by Percival Chubb. London: Walter Scott. 1888. "Painting in Oil," by Louise McLaughlin. Cincinnati: R. Clarke & Co. 1888.

¹⁹ "The Works of William Shakespeare." Edited by Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall. With numerous Illustrations by Gordon Browne. Vol. III. London: Blackie & Son. 1888.

²⁰ "The Counting-out Rhymes of Children: their Antiquity, Origin, and Wide Distribution. A Study in Folk-Lore" By Henry Carrington Bolton. London: Elliot Stock. 1888.

HOME AFFAIRS.

IN writing upon this subject for our last number, we claimed for the month preceding that it had been a month of decided progress. This, of course, in relation to the great matter of political controversy. Since then, Mr. Chamberlain has declared before the world that the Liberal party is *in extremis*. At the Collings banquet he spoke with contempt of "the paltry tactics of a discredited faction who were seeking to promote a dying cause." Just before this audacity was launched a Liberal had replaced the Tory Admiral who sat for Southampton, and since the Birmingham prophet spoke another Liberal has startled both ourselves and the Unionists of both factions by carrying the Ayr Boroughs, the strongest of all the Unionist "strongholds" in Scotland. In both cases the victory was overwhelming. At Southampton a Tory majority of 312 was converted into a Home Rule majority of 885, and in the Ayr Boroughs a Liberal-Unionist majority of 1175 into a Home Rule majority of 63. Thus the champions of the cause which is "dying" routed in the most ignominious fashion the party which is said to be swelling with daily access of strength beyond all bounds. The phenomenon is remarkable, and one would think that it would make impression even in Birmingham. But the story is not completely told. In Parliament the Government and their Liberal-Unionist allies have suffered not less serious check. Already the success of Mr. Goschen's great conversion scheme has been dimmed by the withdrawal of the wheel tax and the modification of the new wine duty. Both of these changes may properly be claimed by the Opposition. The Liberal-Unionists, who profess to be economists and free-traders, had nothing to say against the original proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. And, if we take from among them Mr. T. W. Russell and Mr. Caine, they had no hand in the infinitely more satisfactory business of defeating the licensing clauses. Mr. Chamberlain had indeed, in an access of irritation against Mr. Gladstone, thrown himself quite needlessly into the arms of the publicans. "Law or no law," he declared at Birmingham, he should vote for compensation; and because, forsooth, Mr. Gladstone found it necessary to draw a distinction between the compensation offered by Mr. Bruce's Bill of eighteen years ago and that which was proposed by Mr. Ritchie, it was added, with true Birmingham courtesy, that "Mr. Gladstone was past praying for." It seems, indeed, that Mr. Chamberlain and, for

anything we know to the contrary, Lord Hartington, were both of them ready to swallow the compensation clauses of Mr. Ritchie's Bill. It is not unlikely that the clauses were inserted in the Bill with their full approbation. The compulsory withdrawal of the licensing clauses must be reckoned the most humiliating thing which has yet come to this "Government of all the talents." We speak of the Government in and out of office, for nothing has become clearer during the past few weeks than that Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain are *de facto* if not *de jure* members of the Cabinet. They are more royalist than the king. Of this there are abundant proofs. It was only in a desperate attempt to save the Ayr election that Lord Hartington allowed it to be known that his friends were not bound to support the licensing clauses; and he was careful to abstain from any criticism upon the clauses. Previously Mr. Ashley (the Liberal-Unionist candidate) had committed himself to the principle of compensation upon report of a meeting of his friends in London, which stated that they had decided to support the Government. Both parties promptly discovered that this attitude was a blunder, and whilst the official *démenti* was circulated that the meeting did not take the turn stated, Lord Hartington's *nominee* was engaged in withdrawing as best he could from the morass into which he had blundered. Every circumstance which was noted at the time suggested that the Unionists were prepared to go with the Government on the compensation clauses, and that they only drew back when the danger became obvious. The Tory supporters of the Government were more discreet. Most of them held their peace until they discovered how the wind was blowing, and then they politely informed their chiefs that the clauses must be withdrawn! Whatever we may think of the morality of this, it may at any rate be commended over the action of the Unionists pure and simple.

Again, if it is desired to see the distance which the Unionists have travelled the Tory road, take their action in the early days of the Committee on the Local Government Bill. To men who are always lauding the special graces of their Liberalism, nothing would be easier, one would think, than to accept frankly any proposal which sought to constitute the new county authorities upon a purely democratic basis. But what do we find? It is amazing, but true, that when it is proposed to make all the members of the new county councils enter by popular election, and thus to abolish the co-opted or "selected councillors," Lord Hartington votes with the Government against the amendment and Mr. Chamberlain abstains. And next day the "Radical" member for West Birmingham protests vehemently, without seeing the humour of his special position, against the motion of making one-third of the council retire annually, preferring that the council shall retire *en bloc* at the end of three years, because frequent elections put so much power into the hands of wire-pullers, and caucuses, and machine politicians! Apart from the comic spectacle of the Prince of caucus-mongers reviling his

own particular instrument, ~~what~~ are we to say of the distrust of popular election exhibited by ~~this~~ eminent Radical, who boasted only the other day that no Government in this country went far enough for him? Again, it may be asked, what became of Mr. Chamberlain when it was proposed to make the county rates chargeable with the reasonable travelling expenses of the county councillors going up to business at the county town? He was not in the House, though it is only fair to state that his family party were on this occasion very generally found in the right lobby. On the other hand, the Hartington wing went with the Government. Truly your Unionist—Whig or Radical—is going the pace; and seeing how many points of sympathy they now find with the Government, when they do not completely outrun the Tories in their Toryism, there is no very forcible reason, so far as an outsider can observe, why they do not effect the coalition of which so much was said eighteen months ago, and which is the only natural and logical consequence of their attitude to the Government. It may be we are not so far off something of the sort.

The Ayr election has caused much heart-searching among the allies. The *Times*, which has a tongue of brass in all that touches the great controversy of the hour, hardly ventures to find a local question at the bottom of Mr. Sinclair's triumph. In the case of Southampton we were told only a few hours before the polling that the licensing question would settle the issue, but after a little reflection on the result of the poll, the *Times*, recanting, informed us that it was all about a local railway! Now, the organ of Printing House Square, in real alarm at the news from Ayr, insists that both seats have been thrown away by "bad tactics," that henceforth there must be no quarrelling between the allies, and that everything must be subordinated to the duty of choosing the strongest possible candidate for any vacancy that arises. "If it is a Unionist seat that is empty and the Tories have the best fighting man, he must be chosen; there can no longer be any standing on ceremony." This advice, if it is worth anything, should be driven in upon the minds of the Unionist party by the more recent fall of the majority on the Local Government Bill, and especially by the signal defeat inflicted upon the Government by Mr. Morley on the chief constable question. It is always extremely foolish to undervalue the forces arrayed against you, but with a full knowledge of what is still before us, not omitting the obstructive possibilities in the House of Lords, those who are in favour of a more generous policy for Ireland may take abundant courage from the events of the last four weeks. The Government is being discredited by repeated rebuffs in and out of Parliament, and their prestige is practically destroyed. With Governments this is always the first period in their decline—the beginning of the end. Mr. Gladstone's tactics are coming to fruition with surprising rapidity. "Let them legislate," said the old Parliamentary hand at the beginning of the session, when there was

an incipient desire to throw the Irish question across the Government path. "Ditto," cried Mr. Parnell, ~~very~~ happily joining in the advice of the veteran. And immediately the rope was paid out!

It is always a pleasant thing to reckon up one's gains, especially when they have been got in an honest cause. The question, however, arises whether these successes do not carry with them a special responsibility. But before attempting an answer on this head, it may be as well to take stock of the causes which may be said to have operated in producing these events. And first let us see what says the adversary. Speaking generally, the Unionists attribute the Southampton and Ayr victories to the ill effect of the licensing clauses on public opinion. And this, too, although the clauses were first modified and then abandoned, strictly with an eye to the polls in these places. It may, of course, be pleaded that the mischief was done by the offer of the clauses to the publicans, and that the withdrawal of the offer did not convince the electors that the Government would not revive it if they could. Accepting this for what it is worth, what was the offer made? At the outset it was that wherever the new county authorities withdrew a publican's licence without previous offence on the part of the holder, they should pay compensation, to be settled by arbitration, and to be the difference between the value of the house with and without the licence. The compensation thus given, was to be paid out of the licence duties handed over to the county authorities from the Imperial revenue, which, if they wished, the authorities could increase by a sum not exceeding 20 per cent. This was the original offer made by Mr. Ritchie. By-and-by, when the Temperance party rose against it, and the Southampton election was coming on, it was found advisable to minimise the proposal. The Solicitor-General was sent down to the Hampshire town to announce that the Government would "ear-mark"—as Mr. Chamberlain had suggested—the fund set apart for compensation, and Sir E. Clarke pointed out that, as it would be wholly provided by the publicans, the ratepayers would not be asked for a single penny in the way of compensation. Further, he sought to satisfy certain growing suspicions that the county councils under the Bill *must* compensate for the refusal of any licence where the justices had not found that the holder was guilty of an offence, although two judges of the Queen's Bench had laid it clearly down that the justices had themselves full discretion to withdraw a licence, offence or no offence. The hon. and learned gentleman insisted that the county councils would, in this matter of licensing, have the same powers with the justices, but as he had previously given the opinion that the judgment of the Queen Bench was wrong, and that the justices had not an absolute discretion, but were compelled to renew a licence where the holder had not infringed the statute, there was small comfort for the Temperance party in this latter declaration. Yet the publicans found the Solicitor-

General's interpretation of the Bill—which practically conceded what Mr. Gladstone terms an *estate* in their licence—not a little hard and rigorous. They gave a grunting assent to it under menace from the Ministry that any opposition would only bring them worse terms, and at length issue between the parties was fairly joined.

The Temperance leaders issued some startling calculations as to the burden which compensation, on the basis of Mr. Ritchie's Bill, would lay upon the country. Mr. Caine, taking the Metropolis alone, put the total at 30 millions sterling, and it was said, more generally, that the country at large might be mulcted to the extent of 250 millions. It is not necessary to go into the accuracy of these statements. They presumed, of course, a sweeping closure of the public-houses. But other views were held in the same party. It was frequently suggested that the clauses were never meant to become operative, and it was alleged in proof that the total annual fund to be set aside for compensation was so small as to prevent anything beyond a minimum of closed houses. If, however, "local option" was to have full play it could not be done for the money, and thus the ratepayer would be called upon to make good the balance unprovided by the arrangements under the Bill. And this, too, though the Queen's Bench had decided that there was absolutely no sort of permanent right in a licence, that it was purely personal to the holder, and might at any annual sessions be withdrawn. And here Mr. Gladstone made effective illustration of the Government proposals to a party of excursionists who visited him at Hawarden during Whitsuntide. Twenty-two years ago, as he told his hearers, a person at Liverpool built public-house premises for something over £2000. Only the other day he sold both house and licence for £16,000. This was the market price, and a valuation such as was provided for by Mr. Ritchie would mean much the same thing; therefore compensation in this instance would have amounted to about £14,000. Can we wonder that the Temperance men shied at such a "settlement" with the publicans, and that the teetotalism of Messrs. Caine and T. W. Russell was, for once, too strong for their Unionism? The country had only to grasp the facts of the case to repudiate the whole iniquitous scheme.

It is to the credit of the Tory party that there were men among them who from the first declined to "square" the publican and the brewer in this preposterous fashion. During recent years the Church of England Temperance Society has enrolled among its members many of the best of the Tory-Churchmen, and, acting for this powerful body, Sir W. H. Houldsworth, the Conservative member for North-West Manchester, early gave notice of very important amendments to the licensing clauses. It may be useful to set them out, as we shall certainly hear of them again. Stripped of their legal phrasing they run as follow:—"1. That a committee shall be elected by the ratepayers to deal with licensing and licensing only, whose decisions shall

be submitted to the county council. 2. That there may be compensation for the withdrawal of a licence on equitable terms. (Whether such a claim is fair or not to be settled by some properly constituted authority, the terms suggested being the difference between the rateable value of the premises, with and without a licence, multiplied by so many years.) 3. That the fund to pay compensation shall be derived, not from the rates, but from the trade. 4. That after ten years from the passing of the Bill there shall be no compensation paid or claimed, under any circumstances."

It was urged for these clauses that they afforded the basis of a reasonable compromise, and that the Temperance men all round were willing to accept them. At one moment, when the fight at Ayr was opening, the Government seemed to show an inclination to modify their Bill in the sense here suggested. But they were promptly checked by the brewers in their party, who pronounced the licensing committee *ad hoc* an abomination. Rather than this they preferred that the matter should be postponed *en bloc*. So it came about that the abandonment of the clauses was announced to the House of Commons by Mr. Ritchie within twenty-four hours after Mr. Smith, from the same spot, had told Mr. Caine that the Government intended to persevere with them! For a Ministry with such leaders in and out of the Cabinet, the humiliation must have been extreme; but there was absolutely no help for it, since modification would have alienated "the Trade," and there was no support even on the Tory benches for the clauses as they stood. We may add an additional and very significant fact or two in this connection. Lord Hartington's constituency of Rossendale has been polled upon the main points of this controversy. A test ballot was regularly set up and the result of the voting was announced as follows:—for compensation, 1435; against, 8933; majority against, 7498. On local option the voting was:—for, 8769; against, 1356; majority for, 7413. And yet there are those who insist that Lord Hartington is a fair representative of opinion in the Rossendale Valley.

It is insisted, of course, that circumstances in Ireland have had no effect in producing the incidents of which account has been taken. Yet amidst the gloom and shadow in which the unhappy sister Isle continually lies there is clearly cause for a note of satisfaction. The Papal decree, which has given such obvious joy to the Radical member for West Birmingham, is still held in suspense. The Bishops have met and protested, and have met again and considered the reply of the sovereign Pontiff. We have heard variously as to the nature of this reply, but so far the Bishop of Limerick (Dr. O'Dwyer) is the only Irish prelate who has taken any steps to give effect to the decree. Dr. O'Dwyer may be a bold man. He threatens to launch the thunders of excommunication against the more aggressive members of the Irish party who are Catholics; but Mr. Dillon, Mr. Davitt, and

others hold on their course all the same, and after ten days they are still within the pale of the Church. The Bishops may plead that they have not gone within his spiritual jurisdiction; but other persons of lesser note, guilty of the same offences, have come off scathless in Limerick. There is a suspicion that Dr. O'Dwyer may have had a hint from Rome that he is a little "previous," to use an expressive Americanism; and certainly there is reason for thinking that matters will not be pushed to extremes with the more powerful Leaguers. Meantime, it must be admitted that "Balfourism" shows a swaggering front in Ireland. In the House of Commons it has had some check. "The King-Harman Salary Bill" had been definitely "hung up" before we heard of the death of the Under-Secretary, and with it the Bill for constituting the county courts after the fashion of the Land Sub-Commissions to deal with the accumulated applications for the fixing of fair rents. This last Bill was extremely obnoxious—first, because the Irish tenantry look upon the judges of county courts as "landlords' men;" and next, because it is highly advisable, for obvious reasons, to keep the Irish tenant away from the county court. It is understood that the Bill is extinct, and that it will probably be replaced by a new measure, increasing the number of the Sub-Land Commissioners, as suggested by Mr. T. W. Russell, and possibly making advance of another cool million to keep going Lord Ashbourne's very doubtful scheme of land purchase. The so-called "King-Harman Salary Bill" may be revived at a later stage, but as there is no longer question of the presence of the "convicted rack-renter" at Dublin Castle, as the *alter ego* of Mr. Balfour, it may not excite such opposition. The Government have indeed been relieved from a grave embarrassment by the death of Colonel King-Harman. Their "honour and credit" were pledged with the demand for his salary, and since some of the Unionists, like Mr. Heneage, "shied" at the Bill, there would have been a stern and bitter fight before it could have been wrung from the House of Commons. For the late Under-Secretary there is nothing but pity. A kindly man, his circumstances made him hard and unrelenting; and the disappointment of hopes, which rested in the life of a son who died last year, embittered the sufferings from his own incurable disease. Mr. Balfour will no doubt avoid a further blunder in this matter of an assistant, and if he is well advised he will quietly let it drop. His duties do not increase. He does not go to Ireland even in the holidays, and makes no pretence of viewing things for himself.

The "Castle" works its will with such hints as it may have from the Irish Office in London. At last it has clapped Mr. Dillon in gaol, and Mr. William O'Brien will doubtless follow at an early date. Of course, it is nothing to your Tory Minister that the conduct of these men continues to find justification in every decision of the Land Commissions. The course of rents is still downward—sensibly downward. But Mr.

Balfour sticks to his system of giving hints about longer sentences (we recall the Birmingham speech), and then of not interfering. It is little to him that a Bayard like Dillon is sentenced upon the most doubtful evidence to six months' imprisonment. He does not lift a finger even to save a great soul from the ignominy of daily association with ordinary criminals. Nor will he lighten by a feather's weight the full burden of an imprisonment which (if it does not involve hard labour) means the loss of friends, of books, and of all intellectual resource. Those who know Mr. Dillon best are aghast at the merciless *régime* to which he is to be subjected.* Probably your Balfourian system has never found better description than in the recent admirable speech of Mr. John Morley to the London Radicals at St. James's Hall. The pettiness, the essential meanness of it, and the needless irritation with which it is applied—to speak only of its minor errors—are almost beyond conception; and if the Irish Executive was not infamously served by its officers, who scruple at nothing in the way of assertion, Mr. Balfour himself must become ashamed of some, at least, of his work. More serious is the conduct of the tribunals in the interpretation of the Crimes Act.

We have reason for thinking that the conspiracy clauses are being abominably abused.† Mr. Gladstone has shown much anxiety that certain recent convictions for "conspiracy"—*i.e.*, refusal by traders of food and other supplies, mainly to constabulary, who mostly go to purchase, not from want, but merely to get up a case against some obnoxious person—shall be supported in the House of Commons by the evidence of "conspiracy" given to the convicting magistrates. Latterly, too, the Chief Secretary has been hard pressed on certain allegations made in his Battersea speech last month, as to the Mitchelstown "massacre." Again, Lord Spencer and Mr. Morley have made certain awkward discoveries as to the return of Irish sentences "increased on appeal," which Mr. Balfour on the same occasion flaunted in the face of his adversaries with so much evident relish. All this, no doubt, is very offensive to the Chief Secretary, who cannot avoid showing his irritation, though he seeks to evade his pursuers by the refusal of papers, and such other small devices as are open to those who do not want to be "found out."

Upon the greater matter of the Irish question, several things have happened. Mr. Chamberlain has published at Birmingham his latest plan for the settlement of the whole Irish difficulty. It is distinctly retrograde as compared with the positions he has at various times assumed; and Mr. Gladstone has promptly pronounced it "all moonshine." Naturally Mr. Chamberlain is offended. But as a matter of fact, nobody has anything to say of Mr. Chamberlain's latest scheme. It was put forward with much flourish of trumpets as "matter for

* Mr. Dillon has since been removed to the gaol infirmary by order of a sympathetic doctor.

† *Vide* the Killoagh case in the Irish Court of Exchequer.

discussion." And nobody will discuss it. In an academic sense the scheme is interesting enough, but outside Mr. Chamberlain's family party it is never heard of. In the circumstances it is unnecessary to go into details concerning it. There will be time enough for this when Lord Hartington has made up his mind to support it. One point only may be mentioned, that Mr. Chamberlain, differing from Lord Randolph Churchill, insists that the first thing to attempt in the solution of the Irish problem is the settlement of the land question. This he insists should be taken next session. Lord Randolph, as we know, wants first to deal with Irish local government, in order to avoid the barbed shafts about broken pledges of which Mr. Gladstone made such effective use to the electors of Ayr. It will be interesting to see which of these plans obtains precedence. Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington alike lean to Mr. Chamberlain, but how about Mr. Chamberlain's scheme? Will the Irish landlords accept the bonds of Mr. Chamberlain's proposed Land Bank, and will the merging of all rent into a perpetual land-tax or State rent tempt the Irish tenant to purchase? These and other difficult questions must be answered before the Government can elect to go with Mr. Chamberlain. Whichever question they take up, their embarrassments will not decrease by the lapse of time, and spite of the so-called "success" of Mr. Balfour, it is certain that there are rocks ahead. Meanwhile, from the other side, Mr. Morley tells us that he will have "no more round tables," and Lord Rosebery, in a weighty speech at Inverness, allows it to be seen that the Liberal leaders in any future constitution for Ireland will reduce the number of Irish members in the Imperial Parliament. This last is not a change which will be unacceptable to Mr. Parnell and his friends.

The agitation on the subject of the national defences remains much where it was. The Government maintain a steady optimism which acts like a cold douche upon the reformers, who make no appreciable headway. Yet Admiral Hornby, the most competent of all our naval men, tells us that for the protection of our commerce in war time we need 144 additional fast cruisers; Lord Napier of Magdala demands an additional 30,000 soldiers; and Lord Wolseley hammers away at the possibility of invasion by the sudden landing of 100,000 men from the ports of France or Germany. To all of which Lord George Hamilton calmly replies that we shall have 54 new vessels armed and equipped in the next two years, and that whilst Germany has not got, all told, the necessary tonnage to land such a force as Lord Wolseley mentions, France would need every ship she has sailing under her flag. *Per contra*, our own navy was never in such condition, both as regards strength and readiness, as it is to-day. One may hesitate to pronounce where the doctors disagree, but it is interesting to find Mr. Shaw-Lefevre going to the support of the First Lord against the "alarmists," and declaring on authority that no sort of reorganization will produce more than a mere trifling economy in the cost of the navy. At the

same time, whatever are the chances of invasion, the War Office is preparing in advance by the creation of a reserve for the embodiment of the Volunteers and by pushing on in various ways the coast defences.

In a recent speech at Birmingham, Mr. Chamberlain made another recantation. He now asks for the permanent acceptance of Mr. Forster's education settlement, and for the making of certain schools—Voluntary, and Board—free; the last to be covered by a proportionate increase in the Government grant. The declaration is interesting, as showing the mental processes through which the right hon. gentleman is passing under the stress of the Irish controversy. To re-read "the Radical programme" to-day is to pass through a whole cemetery of dead ideals. In another direction, however, there is progress. The Co-operative Congress, held during Whit-week, was at length induced to make trial of a scheme of co-operative production as distinguished from co-operative distribution. This last has flourished amazingly: the other—a much more difficult business, but which, when satisfactorily achieved, promises great things for the moral elevation of the working-man—has been too long neglected. But on this matter we refer our readers to Article V. in our present number, on "The Co-operative Congress."

Finally, it is pleasant to know that Mr. Bright's illness, which at the outset raised great apprehensions, has taken a favourable turn, and that the tribune of the people remains to us. Much as one may differ from Mr. Bright in these latter days, his name is always the common possession of Englishmen.

The last few months of the month have been un-
indeed, the people are compelled to ask
wholly unequal success
It seems to be a
of a large proportion
putting any strain
may be said
clearer. I
tremendous
present keep
upon the de-
leather and pro-
power to make a
Prosperity is unknown
pleaded against the
mere question of method
which the people of Ireland
proved kindly disposition of the people of Great Britain, the execution
of whose goodwill is merely obstructed by a Parliamentary majority
now convicted of bad faith to the constituencies.

A REPLY TO AN IRISH DISSIDENT LIBERAL.

It is instructive to observe from two recent articles in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW the latitude of opinion which is possible among the persons who may be described as Irish Dissident Liberals. A writer in the June number, Mr. T. W. Russell, M.P. for South Tyrone, claims to speak for what he calls the Irish Liberal party; and in the July number, Mr. J. E. Hewitt describes himself as an Irishman and a Liberal. The fact is a mere detail that, in referring to his friends as the Irish Liberal party, Mr. Russell totally ignores that large, or rather enormous, proportion of the Nationalist vote in Ireland, whose adherence to principles which are known sometimes as Liberal and sometimes as Radical has certainly been of the staunchest and most determined description. His "Irish Liberals" are in fact Irish Dissident Liberals. As an appreciable political force in Ireland they do not exist out of the province of Ulster, and even there, estimated by performances, are not, politically speaking, either a powerful or an influential body. By the help of Tory votes the Dissident Liberal party of Ireland has managed to return to Parliament two members—Mr. Russell himself, whose majority at the election of 1886 was 99, and Mr. Lea, the member for South Londonderry, whose majority was 138. It is contended, I believe, by their political opponents, that both of them are pretty safe to lose their seats at the next election. That as it may, together they form the total fighting strength of Magdalen in the walls of Parliament of the so-called Lea and Lord Wolseley ham.

A party thus in extremity, the sudden landing of 100,000 men, might have been expected to make a difference. To all of which Lord George, on what it lacks through deficiency of number, have 54 new vessels arrived, however, by the writers in the WESTMINSTER, whilst Germany has not the case with the Irish Dissident Liberals. With a force as low as Mr. Hewitt have, apparently, only one other point in common has sailed, joining mutually in the name of "Liberal"—a dislike and distrust of the Irish Nationalist party. Mr. Hewitt is an Irish Dissident Liberal, who describes himself as a Home Ruler, but is opposed to Mr. Gladstone's policy so long as there is any danger that by granting Home Rule the present Irish Parliamentary party may be put into power. Mr.

Russell (as becomes an Orangeman *de facto* if not *de jure*) makes no such dangerous admission. He and his "Irish Liberals" adhere strictly to "*old ideas* about the Union." Mr. Hewitt objects not to Home Rule but to the Home Rulers. Mr. Russell objects to both. The latter apparently has not even the most distant dream of the restoration of a legislative body to the people of Ireland. The furthest point to which his imagination carries him that of an English Parliament doing "all that an Irish Parliament could or ought to do for Ireland."

Mr. Russell's remarks will be concerned chiefly with Mr. Russell. I do not propose to enter into any disputed or theoretical questions, but to deal chiefly (and briefly, as space compels) with his allegations in support of the Government policy and his references to some of the events of the present session.

But first I must protest vehemently against the way in which he proposes to show why the Dissident Irish Liberals approve of what he calls the "law and order" policy of the Government. It will not do, as Mr. Russell attempts, to make this approval take merely the form of an apology, and leave things there. We are entitled to expect a great deal more from a supporter of the Government than a mere defence of their practical administration of the Crimes Act. In ignoring this, at the outset of his paper, Mr. Russell totally and entirely mistakes and misrepresents the main issue before the country. It is true that we do complain of the way in which the Crimes Act has been worked. "We challenge," as Mr. John Morley said the other day, "even the allegations of its transient and temporary success." We complain bitterly of the way in which its provisions have been overstretched in order to increase sentences or prevent appeals to the Superior Court. We object entirely to the men into whose hands, as resident magistrates, enormous powers have, by the action of the Government, been placed. But it is absurd to make, as Mr. Russell does, the mere administration of the Crimes Act the crucial test of a successful Irish policy. The question which has precedence over all others (before we come to the details of administration) is whether the Crimes Act is producing any increase in, or is it rather still further weakening, the sympathy admitted to be wanting in Ireland between the people on the one side and the law and the Government on the other? Whether any prospect is being afforded us that when the moment for its abandonment (and nobody wishes or believes it to be perpetual) is reached, the people of Ireland will be found to be one iota more reconciled to English rule than they were on the day when it was passed by a Parliament, the majority of whose members were virtually pledged at the time of their election against a coercionist policy? Does it differ in this respect from every experience of coercion in Ireland for the last four hundred years? To make it plainer still, let us put it thus: Tried by the test of reducing crime,

the 'Criminal Law Amendment' Act during Lord Spencer's Lord-Lieutenancy was a splendid success. It reduced crime by 2200 cases in six months, while the present Act has so far reduced it by only 200 cases in a corresponding period. Tried by the test of reconciling Ireland with an English *régime* it was as dismal a failure as every other Irish Crimes Act has been and will always be. Does the present Crimes Act now, after our experience of it, appear to be likely to succeed where Lord Spencer's failed?

Having thus cleared the ground to begin with, we are free to deal with Mr. Russell's answers to the charges made against the Government in the working of the Act. His first point is that the legitimate right of public meeting in Ireland has not been interfered with. It was not for the meetings, he says, that people were imprisoned, but for what they said at those meetings. But surely this is a strange way of rebutting the charges which have been made against the Government. Those charges with regard to the right of public meeting do not turn merely on the imprisonment of individuals, but the right of the Government to disperse the meetings. Nobody can help thinking at once of the cases of Ennis, the two Mitchelstown meetings, and Woodford. Not one of these meetings were meetings of the National League. There was, therefore, nothing unlawful about them, as Mr. Russell himself admits, and yet they were every one of them attempted to be dispersed by the police! The main question is the right of the Government to disperse the meetings. The Crimes Act gives no extended powers for the suppression of public meetings excepting in the case of an association which has been proclaimed as a dangerous association under the provisions of the Act. Meetings such as those at Ennis in 1887, the two Mitchelstown meetings, and Woodford were not meetings of the League, and therefore could not be proclaimed under the Act. Any proclamations issued were proclamations which, in the words of Sir Horace Davey, with reference to the case of Ennis, had, so far as he could ascertain, no legal justification whatever. At Woodford the Government acted as if they had a right by common law to issue a proclamation, and that, having issued that proclamation, nothing more was necessary to make the meeting "unlawful." No such power existed under the common law. If it exists under the Crimes Act what becomes of the contention that the Act creates no new offence? "It amounts to this," said Sir Horace Davey, in his speech of November last on the law of public meeting, "that, although a constable may commit an assault in the pursuance of an illegal command, you may not resist the assault in any way."¹

So, too, at the celebrated Mitchelstown meeting, the riot, as every one knows now, was caused by the attempt on the part of the police

¹ In a subsequent portion of his article, Mr. Russell expresses his regret that Mr. Wilfrid Blunt should have been interfered with; a curious admission for him to make in the face of his previous contention.

to force a reporter through a densely-packed crowd, and the subsequent attempt of the police to disperse the meeting. In that case there was not even a proclamation of the meeting. It was a perfectly legitimate and orderly assembly, which, owing to the unwise action of the police, ended in riot and bloodshed. The meeting at Ennis was proclaimed and ordered to disperse, and did disperse peacefully. The meeting at Mitchelstown was not even proclaimed or prohibited, but, entirely owing to the folly and fatuity of the authorities, was brought to that most deplorable issue. And yet, after this, Mr. Russell calmly assures us that the right of public meeting in Ireland has in no way been interfered with! Or, take Fermoy and the second Mitchelstown meeting to which Mr. Russell refers. These meetings were allowed simply because the authorities did not care to take upon themselves the odium of a proclamation. They had at Mitchelstown the memory of Youghal the week before. The Mitchelstown meeting (number two) accordingly took place, and what are the facts? It was held on precisely the same spot as the "Remember Mitchelstown" meeting had been held six months before, and passed off without any bloodshed or disturbance whatever, only one policeman being present among a crowd numbering thousands. Now see what happens and how the meeting is turned to account by the Government officials. Shortly after this meeting Mr. Condon was put in prison for a speech delivered at that very meeting, but it was not his own speech which was used against him, but one of Mr. Healy's! and the speech which Mr. William O'Brien delivered at the same meeting was given in evidence against him on another charge at Loughrea!

I come now to the press prosecutions.¹ Mr. Russell does not attempt to defend the Government all along the line. He admits that the prosecutions of newsvendors were unwise and ill-advised. What he derives more satisfaction from is the imprisonment of such men as Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Hooper, and Mr. Corcoran. Their crime, as Mr. Russell himself puts it, was simply and solely publishing reports of suppressed branches of the League in contravention of the 7th Section of the Crimes Act. Now no one has attempted, far less these gentlemen themselves, to deny that they did break the law in that particular. We do not defend them for so doing. Even a Crimes Act must be obeyed, however ludicrous its provisions. But if the law with regard to these press prosecutions was one which it was really necessary to enact it was also one which it

¹ It is a little hard upon Mr. W. O'Brien and his fellow-workers that immediately after the statement that Mr. O'Brien was not interfered with at Mitchelstown Mr. Russell should go out of his way to accuse the Irish members of leaving the tenants to face the consequences of their advice. The mere fact that seventeen Irish members have gone cheerfully into prison within the last year is surely a good answer to this taunt of cowardice, and when Mr. Russell says that the counsel of the Irish agrarian leaders wherever it has been taken has resulted in the sacrifice of the tenants, he forgets surely that it is hard to imagine a more complete triumph for the latter than that which they obtained both in the Mitchelstown districts and Bodyske.

was proper to enforce. If these prosecutions were in reality justifiable, why is it, then, that they have suddenly and entirely been dropped? Plenty of others besides Messrs. Sullivan, Harrington, Hooper, and Corcoran had offended in the same manner. These men themselves even, after they came out of prison, continued to violate the law. The reports of the suppressed branches of the National League are still published every week. There are newspaper editors in Ireland who are by this time liable to hundreds of years of hard labour. Why has the Government acknowledged itself defeated, and forsaken its policy of press prosecutions? Does it recognize at last that in the present condition of affairs in Ireland the Crimes Act is literally unworkable? And is it partly because the liberty of the press, as Mr. Russell says truly, is a matter on which people in general are extremely sensitive? Newspaper editors are violating provisions of the Crimes Act every day and every week. If they do so with impunity it is because the Government knows very well that it is totally unable in the present phase of Irish public opinion to carry into operation those provisions of the law which it declared itself to be necessary if law and order of any kind or description were to be maintained.

From the charge against the Government of interfering with the right of combination for a just purpose, Mr. Russell turns to a vigorous attack upon the Plan of Campaign. The Plan of Campaign is a perfect god-send to the Unionists. Apparently it has not a friend in this world. It is not only the Pope and the Tory party who have objected to it; none of the leaders of the Liberal party have countenanced it in any way; and Mr. Parnell, in a recent speech to the Eighty Club, went out of his way to condemn its objectionable features. And yet it has succeeded! This Plan, which is denounced by the High Court of Appeal in Ireland as "illegal," and by the Pope as "immoral!" Could there be any more striking testimony of the state of matters we have got to deal with in Ireland, or of the hopeless task which England has undertaken!

I should be the last person to say a good word in favour of the scheme myself. As a mode of dealing with the relations of landlord and tenant, as they ought in any civilized country to be, I consider it to be a decidedly objectionable invention. But, viewed in its worst light, the Plan is, after all, only setting up a rough-and-ready mode of obtaining bare justice from the landlords when no other constitutional redress can be had. The Campaigners, of course, put it much stronger. The Plan they say, may be illegal—it is certainly not immoral: whereas the conduct of the landlords, though within the letter of the law, inflicts the most glaring injustice, and is therefore grossly immoral. The question of evictions really lies at the bottom of the matter. It does not seem to me that anybody (not even Mr. Russell, nor his Holiness the Pope) has a right to condemn the Plan without

equally and in quite as strong terms condemning the immediate cause for its necessity. Nobody defended Colonel O'Callaghan's treatment of his tenants, and yet they were evicted. They are now back on their holdings, and Colonel O'Callaghan has accepted a worse offer than he had made to him before the evictions. The Plan of Campaign, I say, alone protected those people.

To put it in another way, the case for the tenants may be briefly summed up as follows:—Are they to be evicted because they cannot pay the rents of 1885 and 1886? During the year 1887 judicial rents were fixed in cases the total rental of which amounted to £117,600. This rental was reduced to £80,423. That is, it was declared to be £37,177 in excess of a fair rent. But the prices were equally low in 1885 and 1886. Therefore the rents were £37,177 too high in each of those years. The whole argument in pounds shillings and pence with regard to these particular tenants comes to this. Are these people to be evicted and robbed of their property because they cannot pay £74,354 which undoubtedly in justice they ought not to be invited to pay?

But, after all, who is most responsible for the fact that this alleged illegality and immorality has been forced upon the people of Ireland? No one more than the Member for South Tyrone himself. What was the origin of the Plan of Campaign? I will run briefly over the facts. During the General Election, when Mr. Gladstone's land purchase scheme had been abandoned, Mr. Parnell at Plymouth pointed out the necessity for reducing the judicial rents, which had become too high, owing to a fall in prices since they were fixed. When Parliament met, Mr. Parnell again called attention to the matter in the debate on the Address, and later on by the introduction of a Bill to suspend evictions on payment of a portion of the rent (pending revision by a competent tribunal), which was rejected by the Government. After Parliament rose, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach brought great pressure to bear on the Irish landlords to make reductions. In some cases, as in Lord Clanricarde's, we now know that the pressure put upon them was very strong indeed. Many landlords yielded, but, unfortunately, some of the worst ones refused. The Plan of Campaign was then put into operation to protect the tenants. Had Mr. Russell at the time of the introduction of Mr. Parnell's Bill done merely what he did only a few months later, had he urged the Tory Government to reason, and spoken out as strongly against the conduct of the landlords as he afterwards did, the Plan of Campaign, in all probability, would never have been heard of. The calm manner in which he now treats the unfortunate cause of its existence is very different from some of his previous utterances. "The question," Mr. Russell says now, "is one of payment of rent, fixed either by ordinary contract or by a judicial tribunal." Nothing could be a greater misrepresentation. The rents on the Plan estates,

so far from being ordinary contract rents, were arbitrary rents, most of which last year's Land Act has since acknowledged to be excessive. The judicial rents on which the Plan attempted to bring about an abatement have also since been lowered by Act of Parliament, but the Plan estates (which we are considering) have been excluded from the benefits of the Act.

In fact, it comes to this, that the Plan of Campaign has been used in practice merely to secure advantages which the House of Commons conceded last year to the great body of the tenantry in Ireland. Mr. William O'Brien recently defied Mr. Russell to point to "a single great estate, where the Plan of Campaign had been put into operation, where the tenants were free to take full advantage of the Act of last year, even such as it was." Moreover, it is surely a very recent discovery on the part of Mr. Russell himself, that many of the rents in Ireland are "ordinary contract" rents. Parliament has virtually declared that the Irish tenants are on a totally different footing from other tenants in England and Scotland, in so far as the tenants in Ireland did all the improvements, even the buildings, &c. The extraordinary competition for holdings, due largely to the treatment of Ireland by England in the past, is another point of difference. If Irish rents were ordinary contract rents, the Act of 1881 was an Act of sheer and unadulterated robbery, as Mr. James Lowther still very consistently calls it. But for Mr. Russell, of all men, who supported that Act, and who knows the true position of the Irish tenant about as well as any man in the House of Commons, to fall back on this ancient and abandoned position of the Tory party, is a change of front which is something out of the common, even in these degenerate days. It is all very well for Mr. Russell to endeavour to bring back Lord Lymington to common sense, by asking whether he would submit his propositions in the *National Review* to the approval of his constituency at a contested election. Does Mr. Russell himself at any election, or let us say, even at any political meeting, either in this country, or in Ireland, or in Ulster itself, habitually discuss the Irish rents as "ordinary contracts" in the sense in which he now uses the term?

On another point I venture to differ from him with regard to the Plan of Campaign. The Plan, he says, has succeeded only on estates where the holdings are small and the tenantry numerous. The facts do not seem to bear out this proposition. I may be misinformed, and I do not pretend to have any special knowledge which is not open to the rest of the world as to what is going on in Ireland at the present moment; I do not, as I have said above, entertain any feelings friendly to the Plan of Campaign; but I am bound in common justice to confess that I can discover no reason to believe that it has been in the slightest degree unsuccessful where it has been put thoroughly into operation. There

is the Kingston estate, where the conditions are precisely the opposite of those in which Mr. Russell says the Plan has alone been successful. Does Mr. Russell contend that the Plan has failed there? With regard to the O'Grady estate, though the Plan may not have succeeded on that property itself, it has succeeded on precisely the same terms on two immediately adjoining properties, the Ruttah and the Tuthill estates, and on numerous other estates in rich fertile counties, (that is the point which Mr. Russell aims at), the Grange Keith estate in Meath, and the Abergorry estate in Kildare, the Ely estate in Wexford, &c. On the Massereene property, 130 out of 200 tenants joined the Plan, and it is highly improbable that Lord Massereene will come as well out of the affair as he would have done had he accepted the terms offered him. As to the statement that the Coolgreaney farms have been taken by other tenants, I have always understood it to be the boast of the Campaigners that there is not an evicted farm in the whole of Ireland which has been taken by a genuine tenant farmer. If there are any at Coolgreaney, which I very much doubt, this estate is apparently the one exception in the whole country.

Before leaving his apology for the so-called "law and order" policy, Mr. Russell refers to the relations between the Executive Government and the County Court judges in Ireland. He says that the former has no more control over the latter than it has over the Court of Queen's Bench. That is not the impression of the general public, which is, of course, only informed by observations of events which have recently occurred before the world. It will be in the recollection of many people that three County Court judges, Dr. Webb, Mr. Hickson, and Mr. Henn (the latter gentleman Mr. Russell does not mention), in different and distinct parts of Ireland, increased sentences on appeal on the 17th, 19th, and 20th of April. There were ten cases in all. The *Times* of April 18 reports that, on the 17th of April, Thomas Rice Henn, L.C., Recorder of Galway, in the cases of Kilmartin and Coffee, sentenced to six weeks' imprisonment, increased the sentence to four months' and three months'. The *Times* of the 20th of April reports that on the 19th of April, Dr. Webb, L.C., in Donegal, increased Father MacFadden's sentence from three months to six months, and Mr. Blaine's, M.P., from four to six months. On April 19, the Miltown Malbay cases were heard at Ennis, in co. Clare. The temporary County Court judge, Mr. Hickson, raised the sentence from three months to six months. He also increased sentences on April 20, but these cases were not reported in the *Times*. It was certainly a curious coincidence that the increase of these sentences should be made by County Court judges almost simultaneously in different parts of Ireland, but a more singular thing still is that, shortly after the discussion in the House of Commons when the adjournment of the House

had been moved, to give an opportunity of considering this question, an official announcement appeared in the *Standard* that there was to be no further increase of sentences on appeal, a decision, I believe, which has been strictly adhered to up to the present time.

But, after all, the kernel of Mr. Russell's article is his sketch of prospective legislation. The difficulties of the Government here are, of course, infinitely greater than merely in administering the Crimes Act. And Birmingham itself admits, in a recent manifesto, that "coercion is no policy."

This is how Mr. Russell proposes to add to the cares of the Government, now that the "golden hours" of the third Session of the present Parliament are practically gone. "We passed," says Mr. Russell, "an Irish Land Act," which was "good so far as it went, but that was not very far." On another memorable occasion (in his speech on the acceptance of the Lords' amendment), the Member for South Tyrone used very different language about this particular Act, than now in the *WESTMINSTER REVIEW*. It is refreshing now to find him so elated about that performance as to think it worth disputing to whom belongs the honour and glory of achieving it. But this unwarrantable *mutari non sine gloria* reads very oddly after his former denunciations. Now he tells us it was Devonshire House and not the Tory party who performed the miracle of putting flesh on the dry bones. "Then Liberal Unionism was at its zenith." I am quite prepared to accept the latter statement as true in more senses than one. Only I should like to ask what kind of a miracle Liberal Unionism actually accomplished in this plenitude of its power? Was it one of healing or destruction? It is unnecessary to call any other witness than Mr. Russell himself. A "deadly night's work," was his own expression of last year, in describing the condition in which the Act finally emerged. Had that Act been what it ought to have been, had it dealt with the urgent question of arrears, no shadow of an excuse would have remained for a Plan of Campaign. If it is fair—and why is it not?—to judge from this past episode what is likely to be done for Ireland by the Liberal Unionists in the future; or rather, if we may guess from the performances of the Liberal Unionist party at "the zenith of its power" what they will be as it approaches its nadir, the future prospect of Irish legislation is dismal indeed.

"Some day we must bring in a Local Government Bill," says Mr. Russell, in the most generous mood in which we have found him for a long time past; but then he takes great care to point out, what I believe to be perfectly true, that no such Bill as that before Parliament this Session could be applied to Ireland any more than to Scotland. His reasons for saying this, however, are not quite the same as other people's. I cannot imagine, for instance, from what source he derived the information that in Ireland the rates of holdings under

£4 valuation are paid by the landlord, and not the tenant. That is the case with the poor-rates, but Mr. Russell knows the Local Government Bill (which, and not the Poor Law, he is discussing) deals with county taxation only, and not at all with poor-rates. The whole of the county cess in Ireland is paid by the tenant, and not by the landlord. So far from it being, as he says, a new departure for Parliament to authorize those who pay no rates to tax those who do, denying the latter class representation at the same time, that is exactly the state of affairs which exists in Ireland at the present moment! A grosser system of taxation without representation does not exist in the whole world! The county cess is almost universally paid by the tenant, and he has no right to, nor does he in practice obtain, any portion of it from the landlord. In a comparatively few cases of tenancies created since the Act of 1870 the county cess is divided between the landlord and the tenant. Even where the valuation is under £4, the county cess is paid by the tenants. And this very county cess (including the rates for roads, piers, asylums, court-houses, &c.) is levied by a Grand Jury, which is appointed by the High Sheriff, who in turn is appointed by the Lord Lieutenant. In practice, the jurors are chosen from among the landlords and agents of the counties. The new departure, therefore, which it is reserved to future legislators, whether English or Irish, to make, is to see that taxation and representation do go together in Ireland in the future, as they have not done in Ireland in the past.¹

I will not follow Mr. Russell into what he says of certain proposals for developing the resources of the country. Personally I am inclined to place the sums of money which are to be spent on Irish drainage to the debit of an account which England has with Ireland, and which may be called "The Cost of Misgovernment." But that is a matter for the English and Scotch electors to look to themselves, and we cannot blame Mr. Russell and his friends for endeavouring to get out of the British taxpayer as much as ever they can in fulfilment of what Mr. Arthur Balfour called the "historic debt due to Ireland by England." An important thing to notice is that Mr. Arthur Balfour acknowledged that there is sufficient capital in Ireland to do all that is needful in the way of improvement. The difficulty is that Irish capital is put into English instead of Irish investments, a circumstance altogether damning to the English government of Ireland.

When he comes to deal with the important question of the land, Mr. Russell strikes a very useful note of warning to Irish landlords

¹ Under the present arrangement the tenants pay the county rates, and the landlords spend them. Roads and other county works are executed by money paid by the former, and after the properties have been improved in this way and made more valuable, it does not uncommonly happen that the tenants are to pay a second time in the shape of increased rents. A proof of this last fact is contained in the obligation which lies upon the Land Commissioners in fixing a fair rent, to consider the road accommodation, &c., and to fix rent accordingly.

and to the Government. The longer the solution is delayed, he says, the worse it will be for the former. And yet there is no rock on which it will be easier for a Unionist Government to wreck itself than on this question of the land. To do Mr. Russell justice, he puts his own proposals candidly and plainly before us. They are something as follows :—A great compulsory scheme of purchase is not necessary. Where the owner is a real and not merely a nominal owner the matter may be left to private arrangement, the sale being compulsory only in the case of estates in Chancery, or where the owner is only so in name. Where purchase does not take place, every class of holdings to be brought under the fair rent clauses of 1881. That is the main outline of Mr. Russell's land scheme. In the first place, he falls into a strange error with regard to Mr. Gladstone's scheme, in describing it as "compulsory." Mr. Gladstone's scheme merely gave to landlords the right to sell and be paid by the State. As to his own proposals, the words "private arrangement" have without doubt a very seductive sound. Nevertheless, they cannot hide from us the fact that when the "arrangement" has been made, and the State is called in to supply the purchase money, the State—that is to say, the British taxpayer—would be likely to come out of it infinitely worse than under Mr. Gladstone's rejected Land Purchase Bill. Two dangers of a most obvious character have to be met at the outset, from which Mr. Gladstone's Bill was free. In the first place, there would be the possibility of the tenants accepting terms which they could not fulfil (a danger which has recently been proved to be most real); and, in the second place, there would be the danger that, in the absence of an Irish Executive having a strong interest in the matter of punctual payment by the tenants, much of the land might ultimately be left in the hands of the State (British taxpayer again).

As an example of the first, we need not go beyond the statements of the Land Commission itself. They show how easily pressure may be brought to bear on tenants to purchase at unfair rates. Mr. Arthur Balfour stated, in March 1887, in reply to a question put in the House of Commons, that the Land Commissioners had reported that up to the 10th of that month they had refused 434 applications for loans amounting to about £317,000. Of these, 67 were subsequently sanctioned, the amount for the loan being reduced from about £61,000 to a little over £50,000. Now, what does this mean? In Ireland, landlords and tenants are in the position of joint owners. The tenant is about to buy the landlord's share of the property. In considering the security the Land Commission have to look to the whole property—i.e., the landlord's share and the tenant's share. It virtually comes therefore to this, that in these sixty-seven cases the tenants had agreed to pay for the landlord's share £11,000 more than the value of the property of landlords and tenants put together. With

regard to the second danger, I do not think I can put the matter more clearly than it may be gathered from a Report of the Irish Land Commissioners of August 1886 and August 1887. Special reference is made in that Report to the case of an estate in the county of Louth which occurred under the Church Act. I give the Land Commissioners' own remarks with regard to it *in extenso*. They show the danger of any Land Purchase Scheme where the people of the country are not in sympathy with the Government :

"As one example of the difficulties we have to contend with, we mention the following case in the county of Louth. A purchaser and mortgagor who owed twelve half-yearly instalments was evicted from his farm, after all attempt at compromise had failed. The farm was then set up for sale, and we were obliged to buy it in, as the sale was 'boycotted.' The farm still remains on our hands, though it is a very desirable piece of land and close to the town of Ardee, and in addition to the heavy costs and expenses which we have already incurred, we have now to pay a caretaker to take charge of the property. The certainty that we have felt that a similar result would follow whenever we endeavoured to effect a sale of land of which we had dispossessed the purchaser for non-payment of his liabilities, has seriously embarrassed us in the administration of the Church estate, and such interference as we have noticed above with the free purchase of land set up for sale, in order to realize the public charge thereon, must, if extended, materially diminish the income of the Church property, and proportionally lessen the security on which large advances of money have been made by the State."

After that, what becomes of Mr. Russell's remarks about us having always the security of the land? This evidence directly leads to only one conclusion, and that is, that no Land Purchase Scheme is safe or prudent in the present condition of Ireland, unless you first establish an Irish Executive, having a strong interest in the punctual fulfilment of the bargains. Since Mr. Russell's article was written, the Government have announced that they intend to deal with the Land Commission Bill and the Land Purchase Bill "after the holidays." Their policy, that is to say, is to extend, by advancing English money in dribblets to the Irish landlords, the system of Lord Ashbourne's Act.

Finally, there is the question of Home Rule. There is nothing of novelty in the objections which Mr. Russell raises now on behalf of the Irish Dissident Liberal party. He has merely their old worn-out story to tell, of fear of religious intolerance, of fear of putting prosperous Belfast in the power of retrograde Dublin and stationary Cork, of the League and its alleged connection with crime, and closes his remarks in a style familiar, unfortunately, to the present House of Commons, with a reference to what Mr. O'Brien has called the "two stock horrors of the county of Kerry." I mean the Nora Fitzmaurice and the Curtin cases. On not one of these points has he anything new to tell us, which is not radically opposed to the facts. I cannot go into the whole of the inaccuracies in this

section of the article, for an exhaustive reply to them would cause me to go altogether beyond the bounds of an article in this REVIEW. What, for instance, does Mr. Russell mean by alluding to Mr. Swift MacNeill, as if he were the only Protestant Home Ruler in the House of Commons? I fancied this point had been pretty well thrashed out at the General Election. Among the Protestant members of the Irish party in the House of Commons are to be counted Mr. Parnell, Mr. Abraham, Mr. W. A. Macdonald, Mr. Pierce Mahony, Mr. Jordan, Dr. Tanner, Mr. Pinkerton, and the only Englishman who belongs to that party, Mr. Douglas Pyne. Mr. Dickson, whom Mr. Russell sneers at as being unable to obtain a seat, has entered the House of Commons since the article was written.

In dealing with the prosperity of Belfast, as compared with the backwardness of Dublin or Cork, a subject the Unionists are never tired of handling, Mr. Russell shows, I think, less than his usual astuteness. He damages his case by proving a great deal too much. What is to be gained by showing that Belfast, in addition to being superior in certain signs of wealth to Dublin and Cork, is also superior to Glasgow and Leith? It cannot be true, surely, that Glasgow and Leith rank lower in the order of British ports than Belfast, on account of any baneful influence which has been exerted over them by the Irish Parliamentary party. Yet that is, strictly speaking, the logical conclusion to be drawn from Mr. Russell's statement. One of his premisses is that the prosperity of Belfast is not due to geographical advantages or to British rule, but to the absence of Nationalist influences, and his conclusion is that the less fortunate history of Dublin and Cork is owing to their Nationalist government. But neither Glasgow nor Leith, he adds, are equal to Belfast in the Customs return of the tonnage which was cleared in those ports in 1887. The logical conclusion, therefore, from Mr. Russell's argument (if it has any meaning at all) in the absence of any proof that the Irish parliamentary party have been to blame for the poverty of the less favoured parts of Ireland, is that all cities that are less wealthy than Belfast have suffered from the machinations of the Parnellites. Mr. Russell also seems to forget that his argument can only be relevant against the granting of Home Rule, when he can show (what every one knows to be historically untrue) that the government of the less favoured districts has hitherto been a free government, and a government by the people themselves. We will assume for the moment that it is true that the comparative prosperity of Belfast is not due to the assistance of British rule. That is not the question. The point is, has not British rule been responsible for the retrograde or stationary condition of other parts of Ireland; and as you have never tried the genuine experiment of self-government in Ireland, it is impossible to say what their position would have been had that government

existed. We have nothing left but the task, uncongenial to an Englishman, of discussing how far his country has been responsible for the backward condition of the greater part of Ireland. And any one wishing to preach a sermon on this matter could not do better than take for his text a sentence of a speech made by Mr. Arthur Balfour in the House of Commons on Monday, July 3, 1888: "Of all the transactions of which Englishmen have to be ashamed in their dealings with Ireland, those by which the English Parliament use their superiority over the Irish Parliament to destroy the budding industries of Ireland are perhaps the most shameful."

But it is easy to understand Mr. Russell's object in emphasizing the prosperity of Ulster. He has merely fancied for the moment that he is addressing his own constituents. His mode of conciliating them is strictly suitable to the case. It is the old appeal to fears, which are in reality as groundless as they are easy to cultivate among any fairly well-to-do set of men, of their receiving less than justice at the hands of the majority of their fellow-countrymen, especially when the minority are threatened with the loss of an ascendancy and an undue political influence such as the Ulster men have hitherto possessed by means of their connection with the dominant officialism in Ireland. Of course, in talking about its pre-eminent prosperity, Mr. Russell takes good care to refer to the north-east portion of Ulster rather than to the whole of Ulster. He forgets, however, that the more he limits the district for the sake of which he would refuse the rights of self-government to the rest of the country, the more insignificant and absurd the argument becomes. The objection (as every capable elector knows) is levelled at the very root of all Liberalism. Wealth and prosperity alone are to have the upper hand even in matters touching civil and political rights.

However, it is the Irish Parliamentary party which is the real bugbear of Mr. Russell and his friends. He certainly does not mince matters with them. Possibly he goes even a little beyond what might be called the usual courtesy in such cases: And when a political argument becomes a discussion of individual men's characters, the wisest thing to do, perhaps, is to leave the general public or a court of law to settle the dispute. Easy as it would be to make any number of retorts to Mr. Russell, it is fortunately unnecessary to do so. We who support the policy of Home Rule for Ireland are perhaps wrong in not saying oftener and in plainer language that we cannot entertain as valid the objection to the claim for self-government (which by the Franchise Act we have permitted Ireland to make) which is drawn from the fact that a minority of the Irish people distrust the character of the representatives of the vast majority. Every one who entertains this objection, instead of being a Home Ruler, as Mr. Hewitt called himself in the last number of the *WESTMINSTER*, has not even commenced to master the rudiments

of the problem of Home Rule. He sticks at the very first fence he comes to. Mr. Hewitt's contention is that "the Government must act for the benefit of the whole people, and its measures must be so framed as not to despoil one class for the profit of another, to sacrifice the greater part of the country for the benefit of those who are backward and impoverished." But how, in the name of reason, are you going to ascertain what are the measures which are really for the benefit of the whole people? Is it by refusing to listen to the voice of the majority? If so, then your position is plain. It is the old story. The people do not know their own business or interests, but somebody else knows them a great deal better. How anybody can use this argument and still call himself a Liberal, far less a Home Ruler, I am totally unable to understand. It is a most respectable argument when it comes from the mouth of any one who is prepared to maintain that a "benevolent despotism" is as good any day as a constitutional democracy. Were the *Times* to be successful in proving Mr. Parnell the accomplice of assassins, even that should not prejudice the question of Home Rule in the very slightest. It is not to the Parnellites we are giving local self-government, but to the people of Ireland.

But let us look for a moment at the kind of objections which are now being raised to the present Irish Parliamentary party. Let us grant—what I conceive to be absolutely unproven and unlikely, to be proved—that that party is not what could be desired, even in the unsettled circumstances of Ireland herself. What even then does the argument amount to? Mr. Hewitt goes into great detail, and there is scarcely a single point which could be made against the Parnellite party which he omits to mention. But it all comes to this in the end: that the Parnellites have been the main instruments by which the popular party in Ireland has been enforcing its will. Take the National League, for instance. What is it but a substitute for a National Government in a country where none, in the true sense of the word, exists? Even its friends and members contend that it is nothing more than a substitute, a *pis aller*, for a happier system, under which the people would get their way by more constitutional methods. Instead of being, as there ought to be in Ireland, one Government drawing to itself and employing all the chief political talent of the country, and its best administrative capacity, there are at the present moment virtually two Governments or sets of officials, the government and officials of Mr. Balfour and the government and officials of Mr. Parnell. The marvel, under the circumstances—and considering the enormous wealth and influence, and the channels of promotion, which are all on the side of the British rule—is that the men who have worked the National League and the men who have come to the front on the National side generally have been men of the stamp they are. But how can you expect such a state of things to

be conducive to the existence of a healthy system? The recruiting ground is too small to support two great rival officialisms.

It is useless to complain of the character of the men whom Ireland elects as her representatives. For what is the remedy that you propose? To refuse Home Rule and govern by a Crimes Act! Surely that is a grand "preparation for freedom"! The "classes" of this country profess to wish above all things to prevent violent men coming to the front in Ireland. The course taken is certain not to reduce, but to increase, the power of these men. I believe, of course (as nearly all do who are in favour of Home Rule), that the patience of her people and their belief in the ultimate justice of England will win in the long run. But before that happy consummation is reached, we have a serious fear that a resolute persistence in such wise methods as those which Lord Salisbury's Government are now employing will end in making all Ireland a bear-garden instead of, as at present, three-fourths.

I cannot conclude this review of the allegations of the Irish Dissident Liberals without a brief reference to the two solitary cases in which the National League has recently been accused of complicity with crime. Mr. Russell says he could "pile case upon case of a like character." I invite him to do so. If he knows such cases why has he not already produced them? Why, in the House of Commons and at public meetings, and again in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, has he never mentioned any other than these two stock cases (both of them occurring, too, in the county in which, of all others, the National League has always been weakest, and where at the present it is actually non-existent)? No other cases were referred to by Mr. Goschen and Mr. Chaplin in the recent debate on Mr. John Morley's motion. And this happened in the face of Mr. William O'Brien's boast in the House of Commons that not a crime had been committed by the tenants on any of the Plan estates.

Still the cases are, perhaps, worth going into more thoroughly than Mr. Russell attempts. So far as I have been able, from a pretty careful investigation of them, to gather, the following may be taken as verifiable facts regarding both cases:—In the case of the Curtins, the local and central branches of the National League had always denounced the boycotting. Father O'Connor, the parish priest, who was president of the local branch, tried his best to dissuade the people from having recourse to it. Mr. Davitt, Mr. John O'Connor, M.P., and Mr. Alfred Webb appear to have visited the district on behalf of the executive for the purpose of removing the "boycott;" and so inaccurate is Mr. Russell's account of the matter, that in the number of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW following that in which Mr. Russell's article appeared, Mr. Alfred Webb expressly contradicts the statement that he was "nobbled" by members of the Irish party when he intended to denounce the boycotting of the Curtins at the Central League.

The fact is that the National League had no connection whatever, directly or indirectly, with the boycotting of the Curtins. It was got up entirely by the relatives of the man, who were shocked by the behaviour of Mr. Curtin on the moonlight raid on his house.

The case of the Fitzmaurices is more complicated. I believe the facts are somewhat as follows:—James Fitzmaurice, the murdered man, was tenant to Mr. Samuel Murray Hussey on what is known as the Harenc property in North Kerry. The manner in which Mr. Hussey became owner of the Harenc property led to very bad blood in the district, and the National League had in reality never a strong foothold there. Mr. Hussey outbid the tenants when the property was sold some ten or twelve years ago, and the tenants at the sale, through want of funds, were unable to fight the case out to the end. But this failure on their part to attempt to purchase under the Bright clauses led to great irritation, and there has since been a more or less excited feeling in the district. James Fitzmaurice held *jointly* with his brother Edmund. Both were evicted some two years ago for non-payment of rent (which, by the way, was four times the Government valuation!). James was readmitted tenant of the whole farm in May 1887, and the taking by him of his brother's holding, as might be expected, led to his being extremely unpopular in the locality. He was accused of having grabbed his brother's land, and was in consequence boycotted. It is true that the Lixnaw branch of the National League passed a resolution condemning his conduct in October 1887, but that did not initiate the boycotting. 'The boycotting began immediately on his taking his brother's farm, and was organized mainly by his brother's friends.¹ For some time previously the local branch had a rather flickering existence, but (and this is a most important point) so long as it did exist, not a hair in the head of James Fitzmaurice was touched. The League branch was suppressed under the Crimes Act towards the end of 1887, and its restraining influence was withdrawn from the wilder spirits of the locality. What was the consequence? On the 31st of January 1888, nearly three months after the proclamation of the League, Fitzmaurice was murdered. The organ of the National League in Kerry is the *Kerry Sentinel*, and that paper I understand has scarcely published an issue for the past six years in which it has not vigorously and earnestly denounced crime and besought the people to shun it as they would poison. Downing, the former secretary of the Lixnaw branch of the League, who is now imprisoned for the alleged incitement of the people to boycott Norah

¹ I subjoin a copy of the resolution passed by the Lixnaw branch in October 1887: "That we hereby record our most indignant protest against the despicable, base, and vindictive action of Mr. S. M. Hussey in evicting Eugene Costello for one gale of rent, the sole cause being that Mr. Costello has himself provided shelter for an evicted tenant, Edmund Fitzmaurice; and we hereby call upon the people to mark by every constitutional means their disapprobation for the conduct of James Fitzmaurice who was so violently inhuman as to grab his brother's land."

Fitzmaurice, was not connected with the League when the alleged offence was committed. The League was suppressed, and when the alleged incitement took place his action was merely that of an individual. Moreover, the Central branch of the League in Dublin has always denounced causeless boycotting of this kind, and dissolved or reprimanded the branches guilty of such misconduct.

However, it is scarcely necessary to prolong the discussion of these two cases. Mr. Alfred Webb, in his letter to Mr. T. W. Russell, puts the matter as well as it could be expressed when he says that the Curtins have been "the victims of a vitiated and debased public opinion, induced by ages of injustice and neglect."

There is but one remedy for this state of affairs, a radical reconstitution of Irish government. That is all we contend for. The past has proved every other to be an impossibility. Coercion can do nothing. Even emigration will not help. Let me close this article with the reflections of a great champion of Toryism upon the state of Scotland in the last century, every word of which is now singularly applicable to the people of Ireland at this moment. I commend them to every one who is sincerely interested in Irish affairs, including under that category the Irish Dissident Liberals:—

"But if they are driven from their native country by positive evils and disquieted by ill-treatment, real or imaginary, it were fit to remove their grievances and quiet their resentment; since, if they have been hitherto undutiful subjects, they will not much mend their principles by American conversation. That they may not fly from the increase of rent, I know not whether the general good does not require that the landlords be for a time restrained in their demands and kept quiet by pensions proportionate to their loss. To soften the obdurate, to convince the mistaken, to modify the resentful, are worthy of a statesman; but it affords a legislator little self-applause to consider that where there was formerly an insurrection there is now a wilderness."

R. STEWART MENZIES.

BOTH SIDES OF JEWISH CHARACTER.

It is difficult to realize that barely half a century ago the Jews, as a people, were denounced by members of the House of Commons—Cobbett among them—as nothing more than a miserable set of grovelling money-grubbers. No nation has set its seal more indelibly upon the history of mankind than the Hebrew nation. While other peoples cultivated science, philosophy, and art, the Hebrews, advancing along the line of their moral consciousness, applied themselves to the ways of God, and to solving the problem of human life. In the infancy of civilization, when our island was as savage as New Guinea, when letters and arts were still unknown to Athens, when scarcely a thatched hut stood on what was afterwards the site of Rome, this despised people had their fenced cities, their cedar palaces, their splendid Temple, their fleets of merchant ships, their schools of sacred learning, their great warriors and statesmen, their historians and their poets. What nation ever contended more manfully against overwhelming odds for its independence and for its religion? What nation ever, in its last agonies, gave such signal proofs of what may be accomplished by a brave despair? And if, in the course of many centuries, the oppressed descendants of warriors and sages degenerated from the qualities of their fathers; if, while excluded from the protection of the law, and bowed down under the yoke of slavery, they contracted some of the vices of outlaws and of slaves, we cannot consider this as matter of reproach to them, but rather as a deep shame and condemnation to those who, while professing and calling themselves Christians, violated the first principle of their moral code, which their great Founder had declared comprised the Law and the Prophets. For religious persecution there has often, perhaps generally, been available this great redeeming plea, that the persecutor believed he was doing God service; that intellectual error on vital matters of faith was the most deadly of all moral diseases, and would undoubtedly bring whomsoever was attacked by it to the everlasting torments of the second death; it was consequently the duty of the civil magistrate to extirpate heresy as he would (if he could) extirpate cholera or the black death. Not hot zeal, however, but cold lucre, prompted the greater number of the persecutions suffered by the Jews; and, so far from loving their neighbour as themselves, the Christians murdered that very neighbour from whom they had re-

ceived their Gospel—that Gospel which was the fulfilling of the Law. “Prosperity doth best discover vice, but adversity doth best discover virtue,” says Bacon; and, great as were the Jews in their prosperity, they were still greater when the ploughshare had passed over the holy city. Before that tremendous hour they frequently yielded to the example of their neighbours, and fell away from their sublime monotheism. This, if not a sign of national decadence and collapse, was at least contemporary with it; for when their faith burnt bright and clear their independence was unquestioned, but when they sought after “the gods of the nations,” a hostile army encircled Mount Moriah. But all such vacillating ended with their national existence. And certainly the heroism of the defenders of every other creed fades into insignificance before this martyr people, who for thirteen centuries confronted all the evils that the fiercest fanaticism could devise. They were no ascetic monks, be it remembered, dead to all the hopes and passions of life, but men who appreciated keenly the worldly advantages they relinquished, and whose affections had become all the more lively on account of the narrow circle to which they were confined. Enthusiasm and the strange phenomena of ecstasy which have exercised so large an influence in the history of persecution, which have nerved so many martyrs with superhuman courage, and have deadened or destroyed the anguish of so many fearful tortures, were here almost unknown. Persecution came to the Jewish nation in its most horrible forms, yet surrounded by every circumstance of petty annoyance that could destroy its grandeur; and in such guise it continued for centuries their abiding portion. But above all this the genius of that wonderful people rose supreme. While those around them were grovelling in the darkness of besotted ignorance; while juggling miracles and lying relics were the themes upon which almost all Europe was expatiating; while the intellect of Christendom had sunk into a deadly torpor, in which all love of inquiry and all search for truth were abandoned—the Jews were still pursuing the paths of knowledge, amassing learning and stimulating progress with the same unflinching constancy that they manifested in the tenacious maintenance of their faith, which last they did in the spirit of Byron’s stanza:

“But the Gods of the heathen shall never profane
The shrine where Jehovah disdained not to reign:
And scattered and scorned as Thy people may be,
Our worship, O Father, is only for Thee.”

They were the most skilful physicians, the ablest financiers, and among the most profound philosophers; while they were only second to the Moors in the cultivation of natural science. Bishops, princes, priests, and popes had each in private his Hebrew doctor, all of whom were viewed by the vulgar with wonder, fear, and hatred. Thus, of Zedekias, physician to the Bold, men

told, with bated breath, how at a single meal, in the presence of the king and the whole of the court, he had devoured a waggon-load of hay, horses, driver, and all. Izaak Ben Soleiman, Jehuda of Fez, Amram, Ebu Zohr Abou Tybbon of Toledo, &c. &c., in medicine; Djnah and Ben Kimchi, in grammar and criticism; Izaak Ben Soleiman, in philosophy, Shabtai Donolo and Abba Mari, in astronomy; Raschi, "the prince of commentators," and the greatest French physician of his age; Ben Ezra, in mathematics. Against these kingly shadows in the majestic past, mediæval Christendom can oppose the name of Roger Bacon alone, and the Church rewarded his magnificent labours with fourteen years' imprisonment. "What are all the schoolmen," triumphantly asks Lord Beaconsfield, "Aquinas himself, to Maimonides?" But the most important service which this people has rendered to mankind was in sustaining commercial activity. For centuries they were almost its only representatives. They sustained commerce, and commerce, naturally tolerant, in its turn tolerated and defended them. As well during the period of their national life, as throughout the progress of the eighteen centuries of their cosmopolitan exile, the historic course of the Hebrew people has been by far the most unique that the world has witnessed. Their record has been the despair alike of the philosophical historian and of the scientific theologian. In discussing M. Comte's theory of the threefold stages of religious development—feticism, polytheism, and monotheism—Dr. Martineau says that the Jews always were a troublesome people, and they would be up in the morning and at their devotions long before M. Comte rang the bell for prayers. The Greeks are our masters in philosophy and art; the Romans in jurisprudence. But the Greeks and the Romans were modern and ephemeral when compared with the race that obeys the law of Moses. And the Greeks and the Romans have passed away, but the elder Hebrew stock remains. The legendary doom of Ahasuerus, their countryman, seems to be partly accomplished upon the whole of his race: they seem to be predestined to walk the earth, a separate people, till the Second Advent of the Son of Man.

"From sea to sea, from shore to shore,
Outcast from hearth and home,
Go wander on for evermore,
Until the Master come.
Ages have rolled and ages roll,
Kingdoms and crowns decay,
Yet sounds that voice within his soul
Until the Judgment Day.
He resteth not by sea nor shore,
He knows nor hearth nor home,
For evermore, for evermore,
Until the Master come."—W. P. GREG.

In the modern world the Jews have had comparatively speaking fair play, and, by reason of this largely increased spontaneity, their great qualities and, no less, "the defects of their qualities," have notably discovered themselves. The facilities of modern commerce, the altered face of the world, and still more its altered course of thought, have tended yet further to manifest the direction and the limitation of Hebrew capacity. No other considerable nation has traversed the lapse of ages carrying along with it its homogeneity and its exclusive polity, sustained in great part by its monotheism, its refusal to intermarry, its separate and peculiar food, and—last, but not least—its Sabbath, reminding the great world of commerce that a cosmopolitan caste of which it must take no mean account is in the midst of it, yet not wholly of it, and must so abide, for ever. No doubt in many of the mediæval persecutions of the Jews the love of gold animated the Christians at least as much as their zeal for the Gospel. The modern persecutions, or rather the social revolts of which they are now the occasion and the victims, are due entirely to their mercantile idiosyncrasies. In Russia, for instance, as Consul Wagstaff tells us, "the Jews are compared to parasites that have settled on a plant not vigorous enough to throw them off, and which is being gradually sapped of its vitality." It is not simply that in imperfectly organized communities the Jews are the bankers, money-lenders, innkeepers, and middlemen; but they are all this, not as separate individuals, but as a highly organized guild of foreigners, spreading its tentacles over the whole country till all the material resources are at last in its grasp. Those who are familiar with the history of France will remember that something of the sort happened in that country during the thirteenth century. The commercial specialities of the race are sometimes said to have been forced upon them by their Christian persecutors, but a formidable array of Old Testament and Talmudic testimony is at hand to show that these marks for the hostility of mankind had a strictly national origin. The most evangelical of their prophets has said: "Ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves, and strangers (*i.e.*, Gentiles) shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your ploughmen and your vine dressers." The Jew was forbidden by the Mosaic Law to lend on usury to one of his own nation, but he was permitted to take usury *ad libitum* from the Gentile. If, moreover, the explanation of the learned Hebrew, Dr. Adler, is correct, the origin of these unamiable traits is still more manifest, for he says that the ordinary Jewish character is founded rather on the Talmud than on the Old Testament, and in this respect the Talmud is very pronounced. This may be so, and yet it hardly accounts for the utterly materialistic tendencies which the people have developed in this latter day. Eldersheim (*History of the Jews*) endeavours to account for it by the ordeal the

race passed through during the Middle Ages, and in less degree up to the beginning of the present century, and he says that they had thus engrafted upon them the materialistic hardness of the Teutonic race. May we not add that, finding this world so stern a school, taught from their infancy that justice and mercy were the last things they might expect from the peoples among whom they sojourned, the belief that this world is ruled by a Providence "whose mercy is over all his works" as a living sentiment almost died out of their religious consciousness, being gradually displaced by the despairing thought of Isaiah, "Verily Thou art a God that hidest Thyself." Another cause of the unpopularity of the Jews is that they are extremely pushing; all Jews are vain, and hence self-assertive, which indeed is the case of all Orientals, except a few of the highest type; but they are not more pushing than the Scotch were or than the Greeks are, or than the Germans are in England, or the Poles in Germany when they come into contact with the Jews. The success of the Jew is owing to his quickness of insight—his strenuousness, so invaluable in this our day; on the other hand, his defects are weighty and not few.

The Hebrews have never founded a State of any magnitude, though they have always been more numerous than the Romans who conquered the world, and now exceed in numbers any of the minor peoples of Europe, being somewhere about six millions three hundred thousand. The anti-Jewish prejudices of Central Europe are still strong, especially in the Balkans, where an idea is entertained that the Jews are much too favourable to the Mahomedans, with whom they have ties of ceremonial and even of theological kinship. They are, therefore, shamefully persecuted. Prince Alexander, however, not only protected them, but accepted the services of a whole battalion of five hundred men, composed exclusively of Jews—an incident without a precedent in the history of Europe. The Hebrews have never made even an effort to become a nation, which, in recent times at all events, would have been easy for them, on better soils than Palestine. With a momentary exception in Moorish Spain they have never dominated any people, or conciliated any people, even in the East, where they have had fair chances, or founded any great city, or done anything, except in theology, of which history hitherto has found itself compelled to take great notice. They have never, since the Maccabees, produced a great soldier, for Massena was only second rate; the Jewish Chief of the Staff on the Austrian side, Marshal Benedek, did not succeed at Sadowa; and we cannot yet credit them with a statesman of the first class. Lord Beaconsfield was hardly more than a great party leader in politics, though he had a certain genius for apprehending the passing waves of emotion in the British people; Herr Lasker has never overthrown a Government, M. Crémieux proved a failure at Bordeaux, M. Fould was only a clear

headed banker, Sir Drummond Wolff has scarcely made his mark; and, if M. Gambetta was, as the Jewish papers said, Hebrew by descent, he was at once the strongest representative of the race and the one whose blood was least pure. The Jews have never produced a very great engineer, and, curiously enough, have not risen to the front rank among the captains of industry. There has been no man of the race who as an inventor is on a level with Arkwright; or as manufacturer with Titus Salt; or as contractor with Lord Brassey. The Jew has not the constructive faculties in any unusual degree, and still less the industrial (not but what he will work very hard indeed in his appropriate sphere); in fact, he produces nothing—neither buildings, nor food, nor ships. But he has strenuousness, which in many departments compensates for industry. He succeeds as a lawyer, as in the case of Sir George Jessel; as an official, as in the case of Mr. Goschen; as a professor, as in the case of Ewald and Neander; as an advocate, as in the case of Mr. Justice Cohen; as a Parliamentary debater, as in the case of Lord Beaconsfield; as a proprietor of journals, as in the case of Mr. Levy Lawson; as a physician—but we do not for the moment remember a name of special eminence; and in many walks of literature, occasionally, as in Heine's case, rising to the highest. That he is a great wealth-maker we should, if we had the courage to defy a universal prepossession, be inclined to deny, for he adds nothing to the wealth of the world, and the mass of his nation remains, therefore, poor to penury, no poverty surpassing that of Russian, Polish, German, and Austrian Jews—that is, of the enormous majority; but he has mastered the secret that money is to be made rapidly by the distribution of products; he has been compelled by the oppression of ages to comprehend exactly the value of paper "securities," and the mode of dealing with them; and, his intellect being exactly fitted to the work, whenever he gets fair play in those departments of life he beats all competitors, except perhaps the Armenians and Parsees. The Armenians have never invaded the orderly countries, and have therefore never been able to accumulate freely; and the Parsees have confined their great capacities to rather too narrow a field, the trade of India and a few ports of the Southern Asiatic Coasts. Neither Armenian, Parsee, nor Christian, however, will labour as the Jew labours in his own groove, take half the trouble, or watch opportunity with half the aggressive intelligence. Within his not extensive limits the Jew succeeds, and nobody succeeds like him, and, as he is extremely strenuous, rarely burdens himself with more education than he needs—for though Jews are, in some departments, among the most cultivated of mankind, the majority care more to be linguists, mathematicians, and masters of the ways of trade. In occupations within his ken, taking into account the above considerations, and, moreover, that he has the sympathy and succour of his entire people,

no wonder that he rises more rapidly and with less friction than his compeers, till in some places every prominent person seems to be more or less a Jew, and Dr. Stocker's fierce epigram becomes literally true; "at the post-mortem examination of a body lately there were present the district physician, the lawyer, the surgeon, and a fourth official, all Jews, and none but the corpse was German." Their pride of race alike in the good and bad aspect of that sentiment has never been surpassed. They not only regard themselves as of a higher and holier polity than the rest of the world, but they look down on other races as both parvenu and stupid. Compare Lord Beaconsfield when he is speaking of the English or the Irish and when the subject is his own people. Who has ever forgotten that psalm in honour of his race which Sidonia sings in *Coningsby*? —

"In consequence of what transpired at Madrid I went straight to Paris to consult the President of the French Council. I beheld the son of a French Jew, a hero, an imperial Marshal, and very properly so, for who should be military heroes if not those who worship the Lord of Hosts? And is Soult a Hebrew? Yes, and several of the French Marshals and the most famous Massena for example—his real name was Manassch. . . . You see, my dear Coningsby, that the world is governed by very different personages to what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes. Favoured by nature and by nature's God we produced the lyre of David; we gave you Isaiah and Ezekiel; they are our Olynthians, our Philippics. Favoured by nature we still remain; but in exact proportion as we have been favoured by nature we have been persecuted by man. After a thousand struggles—after acts of heroic courage that Rome has never equalled—deeds of divine patriotism that Athens and Sparta and Carthage have never excelled, we have endured fifteen hundred years of supernatural slavery; during which every device that can degrade or destroy man has been the destiny that we have sustained and baffled. The Hebrew child has entered adolescence only to learn that he was the Pariah of that ungrateful Europe that owes to him the best part of its laws, a fine portion of its literature, and all its religion. Great poets require a public; we have been content with the immortal melodies that we sang more than two thousand years ago by the waters of Babylon and wept. They record our triumphs; they solace our affliction. Great orators are the creatures of popular assemblies; we were permitted only by stealth to meet even in our temples. And as for great writers, the catalogue is not blank. . . . But the passionate and creative genius that is the nearest link to divinity, and which no human tyranny can destroy, though it can divert it—that should have stirred the hearts of nations by its inspired sympathy or governed Senates by its burning eloquence, has found a medium for its expression, to which, in spite of your prejudices and your evil passions, you have been obliged to bow. The ear, the voice, the fancy teeming with combinations, the imagination fervent with picture and emotion that came from Caucasus, and which we have preserved unpolluted, have endowed us with almost the exclusive privilege of music; that science of harmonious sounds which the ancients recognized as most divine and deified in the person of their most beautiful creation. I speak not of the past, though were I to enter into the history of the lords of melody you would find it the annals of Hebrew genius. But at this moment, even, musical Europe is ours. There is not a company of singers, not an orchestra in a single capital, that are not crowded with our children."

Coming from the unromantic and impassive—not to say cynical—Lord Beaconsfield, this is pleasant reading enough, and he must be indeed a cold critic who cannot allow for the generous partiality of enthusiastic sympathy. All the same we shall, perhaps, be nearer to a judicial sum of the matter if we conclude with the reflection that the Jewish character seems to resist all pressure of circumstance, and to be substantially what it has been from the days of the Pharaohs—the character, that is to say, of a singularly stubborn or “stiff-necked” people; very earthly in their desires, though full of capacity; never spiritual, yet able to produce from time to time—at least so long as the national life remained unshattered—men of lofty spiritual gifts; not artistic in temperament, yet possessing, in the most marked and special degree, the organization which enables those to whom it is given to surpass mankind in music, whether as composers, singers, or instrumentalists; not numbering among them great scientific discoverers, nor indeed loving science for its own sake, yet here, as elsewhere, effectually following the lead of the mind of alien races with a single eye for the goal of their own material aggrandizement; commercial to the highest degree, yet with no bent for manufacture; not pusillanimous, yet neither warlike nor military; the only nation of the East that has been able to assimilate Western civilization, but has refused to be assimilated by it. The central idea of Jewish polity is that temporal rewards and punishments are the mark of the Divine approbation or displeasure. The hardening, narrowing influence of such a creed was sufficiently obvious even while, within the Jewish polity itself, men were to be found who—like the author of the Book of Job—had attained sufficient spiritual elevation to expose the cruel falsehood of the popular faith. But to this hour it is an insoluble mystery how the Book of Job became incorporated into the Hebrew Canon, so alien is its teaching from the general prepossessions of the national literature. No wonder then that in the popular Hebrew mind true Judaism has come to mean the art of getting on—of making the most of this world and completely ignoring any other. At what a cost!

FRED. J. DOWSETT.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

MORE than fifty years ago, Macaulay, in his admirable speech in the House of Commons, on the occasion of the second reading of the Bill for effecting an arrangement with the East India Company, and for the better government of the King's Indian territories, laid emphasis upon the rapidity with which, even at that date (1833), the public mind of India was advancing, and upon the attention paid by the higher classes of the natives to those intellectual pursuits, on the cultivation of which the superiority of the European race to the rest of mankind principally depends. Seven years ago, an Indian statesman, with an experience even riper than that of the eloquent historian, warned the Government in India to be prepared "to realize the fact that the hearts of educated natives are deeply stirred by the Western education, and that an active process of mental fermentation is setting in."¹ We should, therefore, in some measure be prepared to consider the proceedings of the Indian National Congresses, the third of which held its meetings in Madras at the close of last year; but we do not think it rash to hazard the statement that the telegraphic summaries of news from the Southern Presidency, which at the time appeared in our newspapers, caused most of those persons who read them a considerable amount of questioning in regard to the previous Congresses, of which, indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that not one Englishman in a thousand has even heard, far less has given heed to. In Macaulay's time "a broken head in Cold Bath Fields" produced a greater sensation than three pitched battles in India; and though the electric telegraph and the enterprise of special correspondents have rendered impossible on the part of the English public such a state of indifference to events of importance happening nowadays in any quarter of the globe, it is beyond dispute that the utmost difficulty is experienced in attracting the attention of home-staying English folk to a consideration of the affairs of India.

"We are free, we are civilized, to little purpose," said Macaulay, "if we grudge to any portion of the human race an equal measure of freedom and civilization." And it has now come to be matter of common knowledge that the public mind of India has expanded under our system, and that by good government on our part we have so

¹ *India in 1880*, p. 124. By Sir Richard Temple, Bart., M.P., G.C.S.I., D.C.L. Second Edition. London: John Murray. 1881.

educated our fellow-subjects of the great dependency as to develop in them a capacity for the better government of themselves, than ever was the case in any former period. James Mill, who used to maintain that no nation which had not a representative legislature, chosen by universal suffrage, could enjoy security against oppression, when he was asked whether he thought representative government practicable in India, frankly answered that it was "utterly out of the question;" and Macaulay urged that, as we had "to engraft on despotism those blessings which are the natural fruits of liberty," it behoved us to be "cautious, even to the verge of timidity." Yet within the brief span of half a century we find ourselves face to face with the fact that a number of Indian citizens—comprising many of the best educated and most energetic of their class, and in many instances enjoying the prestige of having been elected as delegates by the suffrages of hundreds and thousands of their fellow-citizens—have met together in formal conference for three consecutive years, and after several days' discussion have formulated resolutions demanding from their rulers the benefits of European institutions. Uncertain himself whether such a day would ever come, Macaulay emphatically declared he would never attempt to avert or retard it. To him it appeared that the day, should it ever dawn, could only be regarded as "the proudest day in English history." "To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens, would indeed be a title to glory all our own."

The great fact of the Indian problem that has to be faced and must speedily be dealt with is, that, on the one hand, our connection with India has resulted in enormously widening and deepening our Imperial responsibilities in diplomacy and as a military nation; whilst, on the other hand, a population has sprung up in India under our fostering care far exceeding in numbers any that has ever before been supported in the peninsula; and of this population a small section confronts us that has been "nurtured on the strong meat of English political eloquence," and "trained to political aspirations which the general state of India allows us only gradually to satisfy; a class keenly alive to the hard lot of the great body of their countrymen, well aware of the palliatives which representative institutions in England have applied to social suffering, and eager to be allowed to make trial of similar institutions for themselves."¹

In the course of the last fifty years the territory over which the Queen of England now reigns as Empress has expanded from about half a million square miles to an area more than twice as large. Fifty years ago fewer than 20,000 English soldiers were deemed a sufficient force to keep in India; now the number stationed in the

¹ Sir W. W. Hunter, in a Letter to the *Times*, November 4, 1887.

peninsula approaches 70,000. The East India Company relied upon its own navy and army for the defence of British India; now the Imperial forces of the Crown find their chief care lies in the safeguarding of the Indian Empire. In less than the space of another half century this duty will probably be largely and directly shared in by our brethren in the Australasian colonies, to whom, in our opinion, it will be a matter of supreme importance that the markets offered by a population of (say) three hundred million fellow subjects of the British Crown should be unreservedly thrown open. But at the present moment the question that concerns Englishmen generally, to a degree they little appreciate, is how to concede in a manner and to an extent that shall not be harmful to Imperial interests, the demands that a large body of the educated natives of India have formulated for the grant of a more considerable share in the government of the country.

Representatives of the educated classes have now for three consecutive years met in council in each of the chief cities of India, and, by the display of the originating energy that was needed to bring to fruition the first Congress, the perseverance and conciliatory disposition that resulted in the second Congress, and the continued energy, perseverance, and success combined that brought together over six hundred delegates at the third Congress, they have shown themselves to be both possessed of qualities and animated by sentiments well calculated to achieve for them all that is desirable and reasonable in their claims. By the broader diffusion of a knowledge of these qualities and sentiments, as well as of the actual claims advanced at the Congresses, amongst all who have a real, earnest care for the welfare of the Commonwealth to which Englishmen and Indians equally belong, we do not doubt that public opinion will impel the Government of India to continue to extend, at an accelerated rate, the granting of local self-government, with the object of furthering the political education of the people.

The idea of holding a Congress appears to have originated with the members of the Indian National Union, who, in the spring of 1885, issued a circular, in which Poona was selected as the place of assembly, on the ground of its central position and consequent accessibility—a point of some importance when the considerable distances were borne in mind over which many of the delegates would have to travel. The opening of the Conference was fixed for December 25, and it was announced that the delegates would be “leading politicians well acquainted with the English language,” chosen from all parts of the three Presidencies. The direct objects of the Conference were declared to be:—

- (1). To enable all the most earnest labourers in the cause of national progress to become personally known to each other ;

(2). To discuss and decide upon the political operations to be undertaken during the ensuing year.

No attempt was made to disguise the ulterior object of the conveners, who went on to state that, "indirectly this Conference will form the germ of a native Parliament, and, if properly conducted, will constitute in a few years an unanswerable reply to the assertion that India is still wholly unfit for any form of representative institutions."¹

At the eleventh hour, and after the Sarvajanic Sabha, acting as a Reception Committee, had actually completed all their preparations, an outbreak of cholera occurred at Poona, and it was decided to hold the Conference at Bombay. Accordingly on the 27th of December the representatives arrived at Bombay, and, having decided the order of the proceedings for the next three days, the first Congress was formally opened on the following day, nearly a hundred gentlemen being present. Of these only about seventy are claimed to have been representatives, as there were present many Government servants, "who did not take any direct part in the discussions, but attended only as *amici curiæ*, to listen and advise." Among those present were "barristers, solicitors, pleaders, merchants, landowners, bankers, medical men, newspaper editors and proprietors, principals and professors of independent colleges, head-masters of schools, religious teachers, and reformers. . . . All the leading native political associations and the principal Anglo-native newspapers were represented; there were present, also, members of legislative councils, presidents and members of municipal committees and local boards."

The Congress met in the great Hall of the Goculdas Tejpal Sanscrit College, and the proceedings were commenced by Mr. A. O. Hume (Bengal, son of Joseph Hume, so well known in the House of Commons forty years ago), who proposed that Mr. W. C. Bonerjee, standing counsel, Bengal, be invited to assume the office of President of the Congress. Mr. Bonerjee, in acknowledging the honour, said that "never had so important and comprehensive an assemblage occurred within historical times on the soil of India." He claimed for it an entirely representative character, and urged that "if community of sentiments, community of feelings, and community of wants enabled any one to speak on behalf of others, then assuredly they might justly claim to be the representatives of the people of India." Though no formal elections had been held, the representatives had been selected by all the different associations and bodies, and everywhere throughout the different provinces of India the news of the coming Congress had been received by the people at large with great satisfaction during the past year. In concluding his Address the President is reported in the *Proceedings*, as follows:—

"He knew well, after all the long informal discussions that they had all

¹ *Proceedings of the First Indian National Congress*, p. 5. Voice of India Printing Press, Bombay.

had among themselves on the previous day, that he was only expressing the sentiments of every gentleman present, that there were no more thoroughly loyal and consistent well-wishers of the British Government than were himself and the friends around him. In meeting to discuss in an orderly and peaceable manner questions of vital importance affecting their well-being, they were following the only course by which the constitution of England enabled them to represent their views to the ruling authority. Much had been done by Great Britain for the benefit of India, and the whole country was truly grateful to her for it. She had given them order, she had given them railways, and above all she had given them the inestimable blessing of Western education. But a great deal still remained to be done. The more progress the people made in education and material prosperity, the greater would be the insight into political matters and the keener their desire for political advancement. He thought that their desire to be governed according to the ideas of government prevalent in Europe was in no way incompatible with their thorough loyalty to the British Government. All that they desired was that the basis of the Government should be widened, and that the people should have their proper and legitimate share in it. The discussion that would take place in this Congress would, he believed, be advantageous to the ruling authorities, as he was sure it would be to the people at large.¹

The speech of Mr. G. Subramania Iyer (Madras), who proposed the first resolution, was a promise of the high level of eloquence that almost uniformly characterized the speeches of the chief representatives, and, as Mr. Iyer gave forcible expression to what may be called "the general sense" of the assembly, we feel justified in giving somewhat extended extracts from it. After alluding to the Imperial Parliament as "the final arbiters of our destiny," Mr. Iyer said :—

"By a merciful dispensation of Providence, India, which was for centuries the victim of external aggression and plunder, of internecine wars and general confusion, has been brought under the dominion of the great English power. . . . The rule of Great Britain has given India peace and security, and, on the whole, has been better in its results and direction than any former rule. At home that rule . . . has for ages developed and fostered individual liberty and social freedom which have made the English people what they are at present—the most prosperous, the most pushing, and the most enlightened nation in the world. . . . How have we fared under a rule animated by the spirit of such a nationality? Without descanting at length upon the benefits of that rule, I can summarize them in one remarkable fact, namely, that for the first time in the history of the Indian populations there is to be beheld the phenomenon of national unity among them, of a sense of national existence, and of a common solicitude for the well-being and honour of their common country. . . . From to-day forward we can with greater propriety than heretofore speak of an Indian nation, of national opinion and national aspirations. . . . It is a matter of the deepest concern to us that the affairs of our country should be periodically, if not continuously, brought to the notice of the Parliament and people of England, and be subjected to the healthy influences of a free and open inquiry conducted by the best of English politicians. Such an inquiry was regularly made in the days of the East India Company. In 1773, 1793, 1813, 1833, and 1853, which were the years when the Charter of that Company came up for renewal,

¹ *Proceedings of the First Indian National Congress*, p. 17.

searching and elaborate investigations were made into the results of the administration of the Company as represented by the financial condition of the Government and by the general progress of the people. Each time that the investigation took place valuable information was collected and was utilized in the legislation that followed."¹

After arguing that Parliament, since the abolition of the East India Company, had practically surrendered to the Council of the Secretary of State for India the ultimate and responsible control over the Indian Government which is in theory exercised by itself, and severely condemning the Council as more incompetent and less sympathetic in its despotism than the Company, Mr. Iyer expressed his belief that, if Parliament and the English public were placed in possession of "correct facts," they would interfere in the affairs of India to the substantial benefit of the Indian people, and he asked, "Are Parliament and the people in England certain that the policy that they have deliberately laid down for the government of their dependency is carried out in a liberal and fair spirit?" . . . His own conviction was that

"about the feelings and opinions of the populations of India, as well as about the manner in which the declared policy of the Sovereign, Parliament, and Ministers [*sic*] is practically carried, the great Legislature of England is utterly ignorant. It cannot for obvious reasons attend to Indian matters as a portion of its regular business; nor has it done anything during the past twenty-five years to take stock of the results of the change made in 1858. In future years the internal and external interests of the United Kingdom will demand, in view of their growing dimensions and complications, even more exclusive attention, more devotion and talent than hitherto, while Indian problems themselves will assume increased gravity and require deliberate and cautious handling."²

Having dwelt at some length upon the fact that of no other country in the world are such contradictory opinions held regarding the most vital questions by men whose views are entitled to respectful hearing, Mr. Iyer concluded his speech in the following terms:—

"In soliciting an inquiry into the affairs of our country, our object is nothing more than to see that correct and full evidence relating to the real wants of the country and to the requirements of its future well-being is placed before the English public. The inquiry, we may hope, will be entrusted to men of the highest rank among English politicians, to men who represent what is best in the instincts and character of the English nation, who uphold and cherish the progressive element in their political system, and to men whose principles of statesmanship have made England what she is among the modern countries of the world. . . . I beg to recommend the proposition placed in my hands, 'That this Congress earnestly approves of the promised³ Commission to inquire into the working of the Indian administration.'⁴

In seconding the resolution, Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta (chair-

¹ *Proceedings*, pp. 19, 20.

² *Ibid.*, p. 22.

³ By Earl Randolph Churchill, when he was Secretary of State for India.

⁴ *Proceedings*, p. 23.

man of the Municipal Corporation of Bombay urged that the inquiry must be held in India itself, in order that "the best and most independent portion of the native community" might be enabled to give evidence, and he contended that it was essential that native Indians should be represented on the Commission of Inquiry. He felt strongly that "a close and constant Parliamentary control over Indian affairs is the one thing essentially needed to satisfy the feelings of the people and to improve the condition of the country." *

Much doubt appeared to exist in the minds of subsequent speakers as to whether they should demand a Parliamentary Committee or a Royal Commission, but Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji settled the question by pointing out that a Parliamentary Committee could consist only of members of Parliament, and as it was evidently the desire of the Congress that an adequate number of natives should sit on the inquiring body, and that the inquiry should be carried on in India, it was plain that a Royal Commission was desired. His advice was: "Say out once for all what you want. In dealing with Englishmen, make up your minds deliberately, speak clearly, and work perseveringly. Then and then only can you hope to be listened to, and get your wishes." The discussion then practically closed, and the first day's meeting was completed by the representatives unanimously approving the following resolution:—"That this Congress earnestly recommends that the promised inquiry into the working of the Indian administration here and in England should be entrusted to a Royal Commission, the people of India being adequately represented thereon, and evidence taken both in India and in England."

In moving the second resolution, "That this Congress considers the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, as at present constituted, the necessary preliminary to all other reforms," Mr. S. H. Chiplonkar, honorary secretary of the Poona Sarvajanic Sabha, condemned the Council as

"composed almost exclusively of retired Anglo-Indian officials, who, as a class, are naturally prone, often from force of habit and sometimes from force of conviction, to hand down to their successors the British Indian Empire in pretty nearly the same condition in which they found it, and who, from the operation of the same causes, are incapable of being struck by the abuses of that system which gave them birth, though such abuses might at first sight strike any superficial independent observer." †

The speech was of a discursive character, wandering off into a comparison of the respective conditions of India and Ceylon (very much to the disadvantage of the former), from which Mr. Chiplonkar argued that by abolishing the Indian Council, and allowing the Secretary of State for India to direct the government of India on the same principles on which the Secretary of State for the Colonies governed Ceylon and the other colonies, there would soon be observed,

* *Proceedings*, p. 85.

† *Ibid.*, p. 88.

"a change for the better coming over India." It is only necessary to say that, as a simple fact and quite subversive of this argument, the only colonies governed as is Ceylon are those constituting the Straits Settlements and Hong-Kong, in which the administration is distinctly of the Indian type; whereas the Colonies referred to by Mr. Chiplonkar and other speakers are those that possess "responsible government," and which, being mainly peopled by Englishmen, offer no basis of comparison with the Indian Empire. A very damaging attack, however, was made by some of those who supported the resolution, notably by Mr. P. Ananda Charlu (Vakil, High Court of Madras, and a Municipal Commissioner), who, referring to the Council as "mainly little else than an oligarchy of fossilized Indian Administrators," justified his remark by explaining that "nearly every vacancy as it occurred was filled by such as had been declared superannuated for service in India," and, though the transit to a far more propitious climate might put off dissolution or might diminish the rate of decline, it was inconceivable that, after the meridian of life had long been passed, the change could restore the mental and physical energy of vigorous manhood.

The third resolution—

"That this Congress considers the reform and expansion of the Supreme and existing Legislative Councils, by the admission of a considerable proportion of elected members (and the creation of similar Councils for the North-West Provinces and Oudh, and also for the Punjab) essential; and holds that all Budgets should be referred to these Councils for consideration, their members being, moreover, empowered to interpellate the Executive in regard to all branches of the Administration; and that a Standing Committee of the House of Commons should be constituted to receive and consider any formal protests that may be recorded by majorities of such Councils against the exercise by the Executive of the power which would be vested in it, of over-ruling the decisions of such majorities"—

was proposed by the Hon. K. T. Telang, C.I.E., Member of the Legislative Council of Bombay. He thought at least one-half of each Council should be elected, "in order to give the principle of election a fair scope," and indicated certain directions in which electors' constituencies might be sought. In each Presidency town the Municipal Corporation might be asked to return one or more members. Chambers of Commerce and Universities might also appropriately have the right of electing members. "Well-established political associations, such as the one whose aid the Government of India recently resorted to,¹ might fairly be asked to return some members."

In the Mofussil districts, "well-established political associations," and the various Rural and Municipal Boards in each province, might be utilized. As to the functions of the Councils, it was at

¹ On the occasion of the appointment of the late Babu Kristodas Pal to the Supreme Legislative Council; and later, when his successor, Mr. Pyari Mohan Mukherjee, was elected.

present only asked that the financial Budgets should be brought forward for discussion in the Councils. But, perhaps, as valuable a function as any would be the right of interpellation which they asked should be given. 'The advantages springing from such a concession would be that the officials would be afforded a means of explaining the motives and actions of Government, and "matters which are always cropping up, but which do not attract attention at headquarters in time to avert mischief," could have attention drawn to them in Council easily and effectively; and that the whole administration would be popularized, and friction between the rulers and the ruled minimized. Finally, in the event of the Councils being over-ruled upon important points by the Executive Government on the spot, the Councils ought to be allowed to forward their protests to the "Supreme Council of the British Empire" for final decision. In closing his compact and well-expressed speech, Mr. Telang claimed for the reforms advocated in the resolution, that they were reasonable, practicable, and not in the least revolutionary, but calculated, on the one hand, to facilitate the work of the Government, and, on the other hand, to afford a fair scope to the aspirations of the people in the direction of public usefulness.

The resolution was seconded by the Hon. S. Subramania Iyer (member of the Legislative Council, and Vakil, High Court of Madras), who expressed scepticism as to any good proceeding from the Legislative Councils so long as the system remained of the Executive settling beforehand, for all practical purposes in an irrevocable manner, the principle of all measures that are introduced into these Councils. His experience was that so long as he, a non-official member, confined his suggestions to details he was attended to, but if he trenched upon the principle already determined upon by the Government he found himself powerless for good or evil. At the same time he admitted, in justice to the Government, they were not only anxious to hear non-official opinion, but they also tried to adopt it, as far as possible, consistently with the principle of the measure discussed.

Later on, in the course of the debate that arose, Mr. Naoroji declared, in explicit terms, that the chief work of the Congress was

"to enunciate clearly and boldly our highest and ultimate wishes: whether we get them or not immediately, let our rulers know what our highest aspirations are. . . . If, then, we lay down clearly that we desire to have the actual government of India transferred from England to India, under the simple controlling power of the Secretary of State and of Parliament, through its Standing Committee, and that we further desire that all taxation and legislation shall be imposed here by Representative Councils, we say what we are aiming at."¹

The fourth resolution, to the effect that competitive examinations

¹ *Proceedings of the First Congress*, pp. 72, 73.

should be held simultaneously in England and India, successful candidates being classified in one list, the native Indians having thereafter to proceed to England* for further examination, was proposed by Mr. Naoroji, who urged it as "the most important key to our material and moral advancement. . . . It is the question of poverty or prosperity. It is the question of life and death to India;" and he quoted largely from the Report¹ of the Committee that sat in 1859, composed of Sir J. P. Willoughby, Mr. Mangles, Mr. Arbuthnot, Mr. Macnaughten, and Sir Erskine Perry, and further reminded the delegates that they also had the solemn promises contained in the Proclamation² of the Queen, expressed in unmistakable language:—

"We hold Ourselves bound to the Natives of Our Indian Territories by the same obligations of Duty which bind Us to all Our other Subjects; and those obligations, by the Blessing of Almighty God, We shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil. . . . And it is Our further Will that, so far as may be, Our Subjects of whatever Race or Creed, be freely and impartially admitted to Offices in Our Service, the Duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability, and integrity, duly to discharge."

Supported by the arguments afforded by the extracts he had quoted, Mr. Naoroji contended that "as a matter of justice, solemn promises, and even expediency," he might end his speech, but that his object in proposing the resolution was grounded upon the extreme poverty of India. He quoted Sir E. Baring's "Budget speech" of March 18, 1882, in which it was stated that it had been calculated that the average income per head of population in India was not more than Rs.27 a year, whereas in England it was £33, and in Turkey, the poorest country in Europe, it amounted to £4 per head!

In the discussion on the fifth resolution, protesting against the proposed increase in the military expenditure of the Empire, a generous policy was urged upon the Government, which should admit of the offers of the people to enrol themselves as Volunteers being accepted, and of the armies of the Native States being systematically utilized.

The sixth resolution³ elicited the reminder by Mr. J. U. Yajnik (Bombay), that the past financial history of India showed that a heavy duty as 10 per cent. at one time, and 7½ per cent. at another, had been levied by Mr. James Wilson upon the imports into India in the interests of revenue; and that the abolition of customs duties meant that, while India was to be made a free port for the benefit of the English and European manufacturer, Indian tea and

¹ *Proceedings of the First Congress*, p. 81.

² Published by Lord Canning, as Governor-General, at Allahabad, Nov. 1, 1858.

³ In favour of the increased military expenditure being met by the re-imposition of the customs duties, and an extension of the licence-tax to those classes at present exempted from it; and of Great Britain extending an Imperial guarantee to the Indian debt.

Indian silver ware would continue to be handicapped by customs duties in the English and European markets. Was this fair or just? The customs revenue could be collected at the least expense and with the least annoyance to the people. Other delegates reminded the Congress that the high salaries paid to Civil servants had been fixed at a time when a voyage to India was a matter of six months or more, whereas now steamers and the telegraph had removed all the circumstances of exile, and pointed to a legitimate reduction of the "princely salaries."

The three remaining resolutions¹ were carried with scarcely any discussion, and the usual complimentary votes having been accorded to the managing committee and the chairman, the First National Indian Congress was dissolved amidst the most enthusiastic cheers, again and again repeated, for the Queen Empress.

It has been claimed for the Congress of 1886 that its leading characteristic was that it was the whole country's Congress. It was held at Calcutta on the 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th of December, and was attended by about 440 delegates, who came, not only from all the presidencies, provinces, and natural sub-divisions of the country, but also from most of the smaller sub-divisions included in the provinces. Whereas the first Congress had been attended by delegates who appeared more or less as volunteers and uncommissioned by any constituencies, the delegates who attended the second Congress had been previously elected, either at public meetings, or by societies, associations, and sabhas (literary, political, and agricultural), each of them representing considerable bodies of intelligent persons. In many instances the subjects brought before the Calcutta Congress had been considered and discussed by the chosen delegates in their own provinces before they left to attend the Congress, for a circular had been issued from Calcutta early in November 1886, briefly indicating the matters that would probably form the staple of discussion at the Congress.

From a minute analysis of the composition of the assemblage it appears that the old hereditary aristocracy, the shopkeepers, and the petty money-lenders were conspicuous by their absence, and that the cultivating classes were inadequately represented; nor did any artisan appear as a delegate. On the other hand there were present 130 delegates representing the higher landed interests; 166 delegates representing the legal profession; forty representing the Press, as either editors, sub-editors, or proprietors of newspapers; twenty-four principals, professors, and masters of Indian schools and colleges;

¹ Resolution 7 deprecated the annexation of Upper Burmah, and considered that, if annexation took place, the entire country of Burmah should be treated as a Crown colony; Resolution 8 was, that the resolutions should be communicated to the political associations in each province; and Resolution 9 was that the Indian National Congress should reassemble the next year in Calcutta, and sit on December 28 and succeeding days.

about twenty merchants, twenty bankers, sixteen medical men, and a small group of mill-owners, manufacturers, and tea and indigo planters. About seventy of the delegates were presidents, vice-presidents, or elected members of the municipalities in which they reside, and some thirty held similar positions in their local district or sub-divisional boards. It is a significant fact that more than one-fourth of the delegates were graduates, mostly of Indian Universities, a few of European ones, and one or two of both. So far as the question of religion is concerned, we may mention that Mahomedans, Sikhs, Christians, Brahmos, and Parsees took part indiscriminately with the Hindoos in the Conference.

The first public sitting of the Congress took place on Monday, December 27, at the Town Hall. It was crowded to excess, fully 3000 persons being present.

The Hon. Dadabhai Naoroji, having been elected president by acclamation, delivered an eloquent inaugural address, of which the exigency of space will allow us only to give the briefest notice. Having glanced at the resolutions passed by the first Congress, and shown that some progress had been made,¹ he contended that "a National Congress must confine itself to questions in which the entire nation has a direct participation, and must leave to class congresses the adjustment of social reforms and other class questions." He touched lightly on the question of representative institutions, insisting that they had become necessary as much in the interests of the Government as in that of the natives, and confidently affirming that in a "proper system of representation" alone lay the means of a satisfactory solution of the terrible problem of the poverty of the masses.

"It has become the right as well as the duty of this Congress to set forth its convictions, both as to this widespread destitution and the primary steps needful for its alleviation. Nothing is more dear to the heart of England, and I speak from actual knowledge, than India's welfare; and, if we only speak out loud enough and persistently enough to reach that busy heart, we shall not speak in vain."

Then, with a caution as to moderation, he closed his address, "amidst the most energetic and prolonged cheering."

The first business was the resolution—carried by acclamation—offering the congratulations of the Congress to Her Majesty on the approaching completion of the Jubilee year of her reign.

In the next resolution was expressed the deep sympathy and grave apprehension with which the Congress viewed the increasing poverty of vast numbers of the population of India, and, while acknowledging that the Government was not overlooking the matter and was contemplating certain palliatives, desired to record its fixed conviction that the introduction of representative institutions would

¹ Notably the appointment of the Public Service Commission, and the establishment of a Legislative Council for the North-West Provinces.

prove one of the most important practical steps towards the amelioration of the condition of the people.

Resolution 3 declared the belief of the Congress that the reform and expansion of the Council of the Governor-General for making laws, and of the Provincial Legislative Councils, "have now become essential, alike in the interests of India and of England."

Resolution 4 embodied seven "tentative suggestions" in connection with the reform of the Councils.

By Resolution 5 all public bodies and associations throughout the country were invited

"to entreat the Viceroy to obtain the sanction of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, to the appointment of a Commission, to inquire exhaustively into the best method of introducing such a tentative form of representative institutions into India as has been indicated in Resolutions 3 of the past and 4 of the present year's Congress."

The public service question was dealt with in Resolutions 6 and 7; and Resolutions 8 and 9 advocated the extension of the system of trial by jury. Resolution 10 was in favour of "enabling accused persons, in warrant cases, to demand that, instead of being tried by the magistrate, they be committed to the Court of Sessions."

"A complete separation of executive and judicial functions" was demanded by Resolution 11; and by Resolution 12 the Congress "earnestly appealed to the Government to authorize (under such rules and restrictions as may to it seem fitting) a system of Volunteering for the Indian inhabitants of the country, such as may qualify them to support the Government effectively in any crisis."

Resolution 13 constituted Standing Congress Committees at all important centres. Resolution 14 was: "That the third Indian National Congress assemble at Madras on December 27, 1887;" and Resolution 15 declared that copies of the resolutions should be forwarded to the Viceroy, that he might submit a copy of the first resolution to the Queen Empress, and cause copies of all the resolutions to be laid before the Secretary of State for India.

The discussion of the resolutions was in the main practical, and kept well to the point, under the skilful guidance of the chairman. Occasionally, however, some speech, more or less lacking in common sense and ordinary information, was delivered, of which, perhaps, the most noticeable was that of Mr. Dinshaw E. Wacha, the honorary secretary to the Bombay Presidency Association, who, in proposing the fourth resolution, after dwelling upon the distressful condition of the peasantry in the various presidencies, declared that the real cause of the widespread destitution was the extremely small share of the produce of their labours left to the actual tillers of the soil, either by the Government or by superior holders, under the existing Government revenue systems. He then inveighed against "the tribute," as he called it:—

"Year by year the bulk of the profits of the entire population is drained away in the tribute to Great Britain. Exported to fructify there, and swell further the unparalleled wealth of those distant isles, never in any shape to return here to bless the country from whose soil it was extracted, or the people, the sweat of whose brows it represents. Here is the essence of the question: this tribute must be reduced; if we had it, we would not grudge Great Britain her profit on the connection between us, to which we owe so much. But we have it not; the masses here, to nearly double the number of the entire population of Great Britain, are starving, or nearly so, for the want of that capital which we have not, and she must not thus, for ever, go on despoiling us year by year, of that small capital which our toiling millions succeed in creating during the twelve months of ceaseless labour."¹

Such arguments, advanced in a similar strain, would of themselves, if generally indulged in, soon stamp the speakers at the Indian Congress as a set of men with whom it would be useless to consult, either upon administrative, financial, or political affairs. Even if the number of the Indian people whom Mr. Watcha states to be "starving, or nearly so," amounts to sixty or seventy millions, or one-fourth of the whole population, it is no greater in proportion than that of the corresponding class of the population of London, who probably undergo keener physical suffering than falls to the lot of the unfortunate millions of India. London, though it boasts with truth to be the richest city in the world, yet has (according to a paper read before the Royal Statistical Society on the 15th of May, 1888) one-fourth of its inhabitants in so pitiable a plight that they may be said to be starving, or bordering upon starvation—or, as Mr. Booth more accurately expressed their condition, to be "sinking through poverty into want."

We are glad, however, for the credit of the Congress, to be able to give a couple of extracts from the speeches of two other delegates, who, in supporting the same resolution demanding representative institutions, gave expression to opinions as sensible as those of Mr. Watcha were the reverse. Rao Bahadur A. Sabapathy Mudaliar, a Madras merchant, and chairman of the Municipal Council of Bellary, for which district he attended as a delegate at the Congress, urged upon his hearers that one of the chief causes of the poverty of the country was the want of commercial enterprise in the community:—

"We allow the English to beat us in competition in everything which we use; from a toothpick to a steamer, even ~~the~~ branch of trade is, through our want of energy, monopolized by Europe (hear, hear). . . . Even if we had the complete control of everything in our own hands, we could not desire Indian manufactures to be purchased by the State at a higher price than is demanded for equally good English articles of the same kind: that would not be just to the interests of our nation. It is, therefore, necessary and desirable that, in addition to all political reforms, we should devote our best attention to the improvement of the industries of the

¹ *Report of the Second Indian National Congress*, p. 61.

country. It is true that this has nothing directly to do with the immediate objects of this Congress, but I think it ought clearly to be understood that too much must not be expected from representative institutions, and that the improvement of our national industries, and the development of our commerce and trade by our own exertions, are amongst the greatest necessities of India of the present day." (Prolonged cheering.)¹

Equally sensible were the remarks made by Pundit Jwala Nath Sarma, pleader in the Small Cause Court, Calcutta, and delegate from the Burrabazar Political Association. He said:—

" . . . Poverty is a relative term, and relative poverty we cannot ever remove from the land, but what we want to remove is the want of the necessities of life, and that want makes the people discontented. . . . It is not the wish to have representative institutions merely to obtain power, but to foster habits of thinking and acting for ourselves. I humbly suggest that all of us should habituate ourselves to really thinking out questions for ourselves, for that of itself will enable us to remove many evils, not only the evil of poverty, but the causes of disease, and so on. We should look at the question all round: we should see whether it is any undue increase in the population which prevents their being supplied with food, or the scantiness of the production due to imperfect agriculture, or the neglect of industrial arts that make us poor. . . . We should constantly endeavour to find out all the causes. Let us compare and generalize, let us see what are the differences between one presidency and another, one district and another, one class and another, and so on, and then only shall we be able to realize all the many causes which tend to keep India so poor."²

Before passing on to a brief notice of the Third Congress, we may here appropriately quote, in connection with the remarks upon "the starvation" of millions in India, the recent statement made by Sir W. W. Hunter, that

"there is plenty of land in India, if the people could only be brought to it, and plenty of food in India if it could only be brought cheaply to the people. The railways are, in fact, opening up new grain-producing areas, in which the population is sparse, and the power of producing surplus food almost inexhaustible."³

The main feature of the Third Congress, that met at Madras on December 27, 1887, was the far larger proportion of Mahomedans who attended as delegates. They came from all parts of the country, and the elected President of the Congress was the Hon. Budrudin Tyabji, himself the delegate of the Anjuman-i-Islam, the great Mahomedan social and educational institution of Bombay. In his address as President, Mr. Tyabji said his one great motive in undertaking the grave responsibility of presiding was to prove, as far as possible, that Mahomedans did not consider there was anything which should induce them to stand aloof from their common efforts to obtain those general reforms and rights which were for the benefit of all.

¹ *Report of the Second Indian National Congress*, p. 65.

² *Ibid.*, p. 66.

³ *The New Industrial Era in India*, a Paper read before the Royal Colonial Institute, by Sir W. W. Hunter, K.C.S.I., LL.D., on May 8, 1888.

Of the 608 delegates who composed the Madras Congress, 311 had been chosen at public meetings and 292 were the elected of local associations. The public meetings varied, from great gatherings held in the Presidency cities and in the district capitals, to smaller assemblages, consisting, in many instances, of the inhabitants of a number of villages, who met in a market town and elected a delegate. The "electoral associations" differed both in size and character. Many represented distinct race sections of the community. Others existed for local or special purposes, and included mercantile corporations, an agricultural association, a landholders' association, a tenants' association, an artisans' association, and various fancy franchises, such as the Committee of the Court of Arbitration at Poona, a committee of united editors of native papers, a great Hindoo monastery, and its monastic lands. Naturally, the elected of such bodies differed as widely in their race and calling. About 360 delegates represented Madras Presidency itself, 112 Bombay, 61 Bengal, 17 Behar, 29 the North-West Provinces, 16 Oudh, and 12 the Punjab.

The eleven resolutions passed at the Third Congress may be accurately classed in three divisions; in the first of which are four resolutions dealing with the future election, constitution, and control of the Congress, and providing for the appointment of twelve standing committees as electoral centres for the chief territorial divisions of the Indian Empire, for the preparation of the business to be brought before the Congress at the end of each year, and for the submission of its views to the Viceroy and Secretary of State.

Of the four resolutions comprised in the second class, relating to the expansion or modification of existing institutions of the civil government, that which reiterated the tenth and eleventh resolutions of the Second Congress for the complete separation of executive and judicial functions, even at the cost of extra expenditure, was probably the one of most urgent importance. The office especially aimed at is that of the collector-magistrate, or administrative head of the district. He is responsible for the collection of the revenue, and for the proper police protection of an area containing as many as two or three millions of inhabitants. Lord Dufferin has expressed himself in favour of this very necessary reform, and there seems little doubt that, as soon as financial considerations will admit, there will be a complete severance of the two sets of functions throughout the settled provinces of India.

The need of technical education was urgently pressed upon the attention of the Congress: its utter absence being shown by the fact that of upwards of 3,000,000 pupils under instruction only 6000 are in technical schools or colleges. Emphasis was laid upon the necessity of extending practical schools of husbandry and of providing for the technical instruction of Indian artisans. A further resolution was in favour of raising the limit of exemption from the

Income Tax from incomes of Rs.500 (£35) to Rs.1000 (£70). The resolution for the expansion of the Legislative Councils by the admission of elected natives, and for the adequate discussion of the annual Budget when submitted to the Viceroy's Legislative Council, has received the support of the Chambers of Commerce, and (we understand) of the whole European and non-official community in India. It is, in fact, admitted by every one acquainted with the affairs of India that an end must be forthwith put to the present farce witnessed towards the close of each Session in Parliament, when the expenditure of some seventy or eighty millions of public money is annually sanctioned by the score or so of members who usually attend the hurried discussion of the Indian Budget. The claim advanced at each of the previous Congresses was repeated for the right of interpellation in the Legislative Councils on all questions of internal civil administration; but the Congress were in favour of exempting from interpellation all questions bearing upon the army.

The three remaining resolutions gave expression to the fast-growing desire on the part of the princes and peoples of India to take an active share in the military organization of the Empire. We have read, during the last few months, of one independent ruler after another offering to the Queen Empress his sword, his army, and his subsidy of money. It has been estimated that a million of money and a quarter of a million of men have thus been voluntarily placed at the disposal of the Crown. At the Madras Congress reference was made to "the hundred wild tribes that Russia will tempt into making common cause with her in plundering our towns and ravishing our women." And we learn on the best authority that the continued rapid advance of Russia during recent years, until she now actually borders upon and overshadows the North-West of India, has resulted in convincing the natives of India that no treaties will hinder the Czar's officers from advancing, and that men and money alone can successfully retard their onward march. This conviction, coupled with an equally strong sense of the superior advantages enjoyed under British rule, has induced the princes to offer their armies and their wealth, and the natives of the British provinces to beg to be enrolled as Volunteers. Indian loyalty, speaking through its princes, has offered life and fortune; speaking through the Congresses it has appealed to the Government "to authorize a system (under such rules and restrictions as may to it seem fitting) of volunteering for the Indian inhabitants of the country such as may qualify them to support the Government effectively in any crisis." This resolution, passed by the Calcutta Congress in 1886, was enthusiastically re-affirmed by the Madras Congress last Christmas. As a means to the efficient arming of India it was asked that military schools (such as Sandhurst) might be established with a view to the better training of native officers, and it was wisely

pointed out that the age of mercenaries is over, and that in any great struggle England must depend for her fighting men upon her own subjects. That the Congress realized the caution with which its proposals would have to be received by a Government of a few thousands ruling over as many millions was evidenced by the speech of one of the delegates, who said :—

“We none of us wish to press this question too far. We do not ask that the privilege of volunteering should be conferred on everybody in India. We only make a very reasonable demand, namely, that the Government should allow those it knows it can trust, and those only, to volunteer.”

With such resolutions, clothed in temperate terms and advocated in language alike loyal and friendly, the Madras Congress concluded its session. As it surpassed the previous Congresses in numbers, and especially in the larger attendance of Mahomedan delegates, so it dealt in a broader and more statesmanlike spirit with the affairs submitted to its consideration. Hitherto the Indian National Congress has made for itself no enemies, whilst it has materially increased the number of its sympathizers, and has strengthened by its generally admirable conduct and discussions the arguments of its well-wishers. We cordially wish future Congresses the success that has so far attended the annual meetings, and we do not doubt that, by wisely confining their proceedings within the limits of deliberation and advice, they will achieve for the Indian people the great reforms which it has hitherto been their object to indicate and advocate. Macaulay felt that, for the good of India itself, the admission of natives to high office must be effected by slow degrees; but that, when the interest of India required the change, we ought to refuse to make the change lest we should endanger our own power, was a doctrine of which he could not think without indignation.

“Governments, like men, may buy existence too dear. *Propter vitam vivendi perdere causas* is a despicable policy both in individuals and in States. In the present case, such a policy would be not only despicable, but absurd. The mere extent of Empire is not necessarily an advantage. To many governments it has been cumbersome; to some it has been fatal. It will be allowed by every statesman of our time that the prosperity of a community is made up of the prosperity of those who compose the community, and that it is the most childish ambition to covet dominion which adds to no man's comfort or security. To the great trading nation, to the great manufacturing nation, no progress which any portion of the human race can make in knowledge, in taste for the conveniences of life, or in the wealth by which those conveniences are produced, can be matter of indifference. . . . It would be, on the most selfish view of the case, far better for us that the people of India were well governed and independent of us, than ill-governed and subject to us. . . . That would, indeed, be a dotting wisdom which, in order that India might remain a dependency, would make it an useless and costly dependency, which would keep an hundred millions of men from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves.”

* Speech delivered by Macaulay in the House of Commons, on July 10, 1833.

MEMORY.¹

MEMORY may be defined as the aggregate of mental impressions possessed by an individual, together with the power of recalling them. The extent and quality of these impressions, and the power of reproducing them, differ greatly in different persons, and in the same person, at different periods of life. "In some persons," says Locke, "the mind retains the characters drawn on it like marble, in others like freestone, and in others little better than sand." The causes of this difference are numerous. The most potent of these is, undoubtedly, original endowment. Different races of men are pre-eminently distinguished from each other by differences in respect to their cerebral organization, and, therefore, mental capacity—comprising, of course, the faculty of memory. But individuals of one and the same race differ in these respects widely from each other: children of one family inherit from their parents aboriginal mental endowments far superior to those inherited by the children of another family; and, hence, for the battle of life, individuals are variously equipped from the time of birth.

The most perfect original impressions are, as a general rule, those produced in the minds of children, and so far as that part of mental culture—the development of good memory—is concerned, our aim should be to maintain in manhood and womanhood that perfect impressionability of the brain which exists in healthy childhood.

As, owing to various causes, the memory, in a large proportion of cases, is either naturally defective or becomes impaired, different methods of improving or strengthening it have been proposed. A German bibliographer, E. M. Oettinger, enumerates a hundred and seventy-one printed works on Memory and Mnemonics; and Aimé Paris, who advocated and taught a system of his own in the early part of the present century, gives a list of three hundred works on the subject! Analyses of many of the most important of these works are given

¹ *On Memory and the Rational Means of Improving it.* By Dr. Edward Pick. Fifth edition. With New Applications to the Study of the French and German Languages. London. 1873.

A Practical Method of Acquiring the French Language. By Dr. E. Pick. Third edition. London. 1879.

Memory and its Doctors. By Dr E. Pick. London. 1888.

Loisette's Art of Never Forgetting compared with Mnemonics. By J. Appleby. Manchester. (Without date.)

All About Mnemonics. By A. E. Middleton. London. 1887.

Memory: What it is, and How to Improve it. By David Kay, F.R.G.S. London. 1888.

by recent writers on Mnemonics; but, so far as we are aware, no one of the authors of these numerous works adverts to the important physiological conditions, the presence of which is essential to ensure a strong and clear memory always promptly obedient to the will. Indeed, so far as we know, the only allusion made to the physical basis of memory by any of the writers just mentioned occurs in a treatise by Laurence Fries, published at Strasburg in 1523, and entitled, *A Short Advice how Memory can be Wonderfully Strengthened*. This author affirms that the seat of memory is in the occiput, and in order to strengthen the organ he advises his pupils to eat "roasted fowls, small birds, or young hares, and other delicious things, for dinner, with apples and nuts for dessert." They may also "enjoy good red wine," but otherwise "they must be sober and moderate." The author's claim to the originality of this teaching is freely recognized by Dr. Pick, who justly remarks: "This part of the method is his own; the rest is copied from the ancients." But his doctrine that memory is seated in the occiput entitles him to be regarded as one of the first heralds of Gall and Spurzheim, who not only gave to memory "a local habitation" in the brain, but who taught that each of the numerous faculties, of which, as they showed, the mind is constituted, has a special memory appropriate to itself. Each of the "animal propensities" and "moral sentiments" signalized on the phrenological map has, it is affirmed, a special part of the brain as its organ, and each of these organs, the function of which is to feel according to its nature, can have its specially appropriate feeling which it has already experienced reproduced by the conjoint influence of the will and imagination. In like manner, the perceptions of the perceptive faculties and the reflections of the reflective faculties can also be reproduced. Moreover, while the strength and vividness of the feeling, perception, or thought which is recalled are in proportion to the strength and vividness of the original feeling, perception, or thought, the strength and vividness of both the former and the latter differ in different persons according to the quantity and quality of cerebral matter constituting the organs of the several animal propensities, the moral sentiments, and perceptive, as well as reflective, faculties in question.

Again it is equally manifest that there is not one memory only, but many memories, in each mind; and that one kind of memory is pre-eminently developed in one person, and another in another. "Memory," says Ribot, "may be resolved into memories, just as the life of an organism may be resolved into the lives of the organs, the tissues, the anatomical elements which compose it." Referring exclusively to the perceptive faculties, we need only mention a few thoroughly recognized facts in proof of this statement. Persons having a strongly developed organ of what the phrenologists call "individuality" receive peculiarly distinct impressions of

external objects, and, therefore, of persons; hence they immediately recognize them on seeing them again, and easily picture them to themselves from memory. Persons abundantly endowed with the organ of "locality" exhibit an astonishing power of finding their way in regions previously unknown to them, and of remembering the character of those they have visited. Persons thus endowed, when strongly impressed by the contents of a passage in a book they have read, remember exactly the part of the page in which the passage occurs, and whether the page itself be a left hand or a right hand page. The number of degrees of capacity of perception and recollection of colours is scarcely less remarkable—the power of recollection of them being always proportionate to the power of perceiving them and signaling their differences. Similarly, he who possesses the musical faculty in an eminent degree possesses in a like degree the power of learning and remembering the pieces of music to which his attention is directed. A striking proof of the distinctively individualized character of our various faculties and memories is presented in the often observed fact that the perception of musical sounds and the perception of time, though both alike essential in the mental constitution of a good musician, differ greatly in their relative strength in different individuals—so that while one may be a skilful musician he may be an indifferent timeist, and *vice versa*. In the former case the orderly succession of notes of a musical passage is easily remembered, but the time-intervals, which are a distinctive feature of it, are remembered less easily; whereas in the latter case the memory of time is stronger than is that of tune. Equally notable is the fact that persons who are especially able as calculators recollect numbers with peculiar facility. Moreover, persons especially gifted with the faculty of language have a proportionate facility of recalling words, and of quoting from memory long passages which they have previously heard or read: "Cardinal Mezzofanti, who is said to have known more than a hundred different languages, used to declare that he never forgot a word that he had once learnt."

Seeing how completely each kind of memory is organically related to a special part of the brain, and how completely its character is dependent on the quantity and quality of that part, our readers will not fail to recognize that an indispensable condition of a thoroughly good memory is a thoroughly healthy brain.

But, however healthy and vigorous the brain may be, its various faculties can, of course, be greatly developed and strengthened by skilful training. As the power of the various kinds of memory differs greatly in degree in different persons, numerous and various methods of systematizing the processes of recollection and of developing and strengthening the memory have been propounded. In the course of progress in every department of science and art experience proves that, as a general rule, simplicity of principle, and simplicity of

method in its realization, are the last to be attained, so in respect to the art of memory or mnemotechnics, as it is called, the least complicated, and therefore the most easily apprehended plan is that which has been developed last: we refer to the one worked out by Dr. Pick, or by others who recognize practically the value of his method.

Dr. Pick expresses his obligations to Carl Otto, a Dane who travelled in Germany as a teacher of mnemonics, and who, in 1843, published a book, entitled *Lehrbuch der Mnemotechnik*. He simplified the method already taught by Aimé Paris. Otto's lectures, delivered at Prague, gave Dr. Pick the first idea of having recourse to mnemonics as an aid in the medical studies in which he was then engaged.

"A few months afterwards [he says] I lectured myself on mnemonics, teaching Mr. Otto's system. By-and-by my psychological studies led me to the conviction that all those associations of ideas which were taken as bases for mnemonics system, were founded on a false understanding of the process of the mind. I endeavoured to take as a basis for a mnemonic method those rules by which the true or natural association of ideas is performed in the mind. I soon found out that the reasons why we retain certain things more easily than others, could be made available to facilitate learning by heart."

We have already defined memory as a twofold function—the reception and the reproduction of mental impressions. If this definition be correct, it is evident that memory is good or bad—strong or weak, in proportion to the strength or weakness of the original impressions received by the mind, and in proportion to the amount of power possessed by the individual, of reproducing or recalling those impressions at will. Now the foundation of Dr. Pick's "method of improving the memory" is the practical recognition of the truth just stated. He insists on the necessity of securing vivid and distinct impressions, mental images or ideas, and then of associating them in a systematic manner distinctively his own.

Certain events, certain things we have seen, certain experiences make profound impressions upon us, and such impressions—agreeable or disagreeable—are easily remembered, or reproduced. Indeed, such impressions are remembered without any voluntary effort on our part: they reappear unbidden, and not seldom, even, against our will. It is manifest, therefore, that if we would remember things which do not, by virtue of their own intrinsic force, produce strong and distinct impressions like those just referred to, we must by a vigorous effort of the will strive to create vivid and distinct impressions of these things, and we must associate those impressions with others equally vivid and distinct already in the mind. In order to create such impressions, we need to concentrate our attention at one time on as few objects as possible, and

sciously observe and note their several characteristic features. If during this endeavour the vigour of the will lessens and the attention becomes weakened, the impressions or ideas in question are in danger of becoming obscured, or even crowded out by the spontaneous presentations of ideas which force themselves on the consciousness, and struggle for pre-eminence. In fact, the struggle for existence in all realms of life, signalized by Darwin, is wonderfully exemplified in the realm of thought: if several ideas happen to be present in the mind at the same time, they are apt to become hazy and dim, and, hence, are speedily forgotten; but, generally, when several are present simultaneously, some of them, being originally stronger than others, crowd out or efface the latter, and, themselves holding possession of the consciousness, are distinctly remembered. As Dr. Pick remarks—

“Stronger ideas always beat weaker ones. If those ideas which come to the mind are stronger than those they find present, they will make use of their strength, and expel the weaker ones. This is shown in the fact that if one thing attracts our attention, all other ideas disappear from our minds for the moment. But if the ideas which try to come to the mind find others present which are stronger, then those latter ones make use of their strength, and do not admit the new-comers; they repel them immediately. This is shown in the fact that if something preoccupies us, we neither hear nor see what is going on around us, though we are in the same physical condition as we were before. Our eyes and ears are open, but the ideas trying to come in through these channels are repelled by the strong ideas present in the mind. . . . Say, for instance, you read a book, which you like very much; there may be other people in the same room talking, or even playing music, but you neither see nor hear anything, because the book absorbs your attention. But sometimes you suddenly stop, because you have just observed that you do not know what you have been reading about in the last ten or twenty lines, and you must read it again to know what it is. This will happen if chance brings to the mind an idea, which is stronger than those coming from the book. As long as the book fixed your attention, nothing else was admitted. But a word spoken, a noise heard, or even sometimes an idea, recalled to the mind by the book itself, ‘crosses the mind’; in other words, an idea appears which is stronger than those coming from the book. From that moment nothing else is admitted, and this is why you do not know what you have been reading about in the last ten or twenty lines.”

Moreover, according to the law of association, ideas are intimately related to others with which, in the words of Professor Blackie, they are “naturally fitted together in the mind by contrast or similarity, or by ties of contiguity in time or place, or by the bond of causality.” Their presence ensures that of those with which they are closely related; and thus the conception or memory of one idea ensures the reproduction, recall, or memory of other ideas which have a strong affinity with it. So that while weak ideas are obscured or crowded out by strong ones, the latter, when of equal strength, do not overcome or expel each other, but enter into intimate communion, and so completely that one of them never presents itself alone, but always

in company with its associate. This cohesion of ideas, "which is constantly going on in our minds, is not only the basis of remembrance, but of all intellectual activity. . . . An idea never comes back to the mind by itself, but is always recalled by another." The facility or difficulty with which one idea recalls another depends upon the strength with which they cohere. If their cohesion be strong, there is easy recollection; if their cohesion be weak, there is either weak or no recollection. The force of their cohesion depends on the intrinsic strength of the ideas themselves.

Duly considering these established facts of consciousness revealed by experience, Dr. Pick deduces from them as their logical consequences certain important practical conclusions—viz., that the only rational means of developing and strengthening the memory are twofold, and as follows:—

(1) To concentrate our attention on as few ideas as possible at the same time; and (2) to enforce our attention to the ideas in question by comparing them with each other.

It is obvious that the fewer the ideas of which we are conscious at one and the same time the stronger and more sharply defined they will be; and it is not less obvious that if we scrupulously compare with each other the objects they represent, we must examine those objects carefully, must note their several points of likeness, of difference and of contrast; and hence the precise character of their relation to each other—whether by identity or contrast of nature, by similarity of form or colour, by sameness of place or of origin, &c. &c. Such an examination and comparison will inevitably result in associations of the ideas of the objects represented—associations the strength of which will be proportionate to the strength or vividness of the ideas themselves, so that in fact no one of them can become present in the consciousness without bringing with it others which cohere to it. Thus one recalls or ensures the reproduction of another, and even the ideas of things which we have never compared but which are more or less alike, easily recall each other. "Take, for instance," as Dr. Pick says, "two ideas, like book and printing. There is, of course, not the slightest necessity to seek the connection of those two ideas. In such a case it is sufficient to concentrate our attention on them for one moment only, that they may blend strongly in our minds." Dr. Pick gives some striking examples of the possibility of easily remembering a long series of words, if only we restrict our attention to two ideas at one time, it being understood that they have an obvious connection; and if, while going over the series, we give no heed to the words which precede or succeed those on which our attention is successively concentrated. The following series, which is copied from Dr. Pick's book, *Memory and its Disorders*, consists of the English equivalents of those Latin words of the third

declension which are exceptions to the rule that nouns of the third declension in *is* are feminine :—

Mullet—fish,	Fish—river,
River—channel,	Channel—ditch,
Ditch—worm,	Worm—dust,
Dust—footpath,	Footpath—hillock,
Hillock—stone,	Stone—fire (because of flint),
Fire—firebrand,	Firebrand—bellows,
Bellows—ashes,	Ashes—fine flour,
Fine flour—bread,	Bread—cucumber,
Cucumber—stem,	Stem—thorn,
Thorn—bundle,	Bundle—club,
Club—lever,	Lever—axletree,
Axletree—ploughshare,	Ploughshare (emblem of peace),
Sword (artificial weapon),	Sword (emblem of war),
Nail (natural weapon),	Nail—blood,
Blood—snake,	Snake—dormouse,
Dormouse—net,	Net—hair,
Hair—rope,	Rope—collar,
Collar—circle,	Circle (orbis)—month,
Month (division of time)—end,	End—doorpost.

Our readers will easily recognize that the less the difficulty which they experience in perceiving some sort of relation between the ideas which each of the above couple of words represents, the greater the facility with which they remember them. In putting together each pair of these words, Dr. Pick was constrained to select only those which are the English equivalents of those Latin words of the third declension which are exceptions to the rule that nouns of that declension ending in *is* are feminine ; and consequently the relation between the ideas represented by the words of some of the couples is far from strikingly manifest. For example, what distinct relation is there between the idea of ashes and that of fine flour, between the idea of bread and that of cucumber, between the idea of cucumber and that of stem, between the idea of bundle and that of club, between the idea of month and that of end, or between the idea of end and that of doorpost ? And yet any one making the experiment will find that by fixing the attention exclusively on the two ideas represented by each of the above couples of words in succession, he is able to remember the whole of them by reading them only once or twice over. The experience thus gained is, in our opinion, a striking confirmation of the soundness of Dr. Pick's theory, and of the method of training the memory as well as of teaching founded upon it. Every one will admit that a method enabling a student of the Latin grammar to commit to memory in a few minutes a long list of words, comprising the whole of the exceptions to a general rule, and to remember them far more effectually than he could do had he resorted to the laborious process of learning them by heart in the ordinary way, must be peculiarly valuable. Of course, this method is applicable in the learning of all languages, and renders astonishingly great

aid in learning and remembering what are peculiarly difficult both to learn and to remember, the numerous exceptions to general rules. Dr. Pick shows how, by the application of his method, a knowledge of the genders of French nouns may easily be acquired and retained, and how those very troublesome things, the irregular French verbs, may be completely mastered. In his book, entitled *On Memory and the Rational Means of Improving it*, Dr. Pick has exemplified the application of his method to the learning of the German language; and, in respect to French, he has performed a like service by the publication of *A Practical Method of Acquiring the French Language*.

Various as are the applications of his method, it is itself, as our readers have seen, admirably simple. In his application of it to the study of foreign languages, he makes especial use of comparison, which he repeats, "assists remembrance most efficaciously if we take the known as the starting-point of comparison with the unknown. In the study of foreign languages the known are those elements which we find in our own language, or in any other language familiar to us. Thus, the knowledge of one foreign language facilitates the study of others." For the detailed and practical exposition of this admirably effective method of learning languages we must refer our readers to Dr. Pick's works. We shall only remark here that his method of learning languages, instead of being a laborious effort of memory, is a process of comparison, analysis, and reasoning from beginning to end.

Again, Dr. Pick's method of facilitating the remembrance of numbers, for example, the numbers of inhabitants of different countries, the dates of great historical events, of the births or deaths of great men, &c., is only another form of application of the principle of comparison, and is as ingenious and sound in principle as it is surprisingly effective. An adequate explanation and practical exemplification of it would, however, occupy more space than we can here give to it; and, therefore, we can only advise those who wish to become acquainted with it to refer to Dr. Pick's works, or to their author, or to some one of the loyal (shall we say honest?) teachers of his method.

To cite the evidence of certain competent experts in proof that what we have said of the merits of the method in question is no exaggeration is perhaps due to ourselves, and, certainly, is due to Dr. Pick. In May 1860 he explained his method in a lecture which he gave at Willis's Rooms. The chair was taken by Lord Houghton (then Monckton Milnes, M.P.), who, "in a speech highly eulogistic of Dr. Pick's method," spoke of him as "the propounder of philosophical principles which must henceforth be admitted in all systems of education." He added—"In this method of training the mind, reasoning is substituted for ordinary processes of recollection."¹

As far back as 1859 he lectured on his system in Magdalen Hall,

Oxford. The Principal of the Hall introduced him to the meeting, and at its close "expressed the gratification it afforded him to witness the results of a system of energizing the memory by a process which had the great recommendations of being simple, natural, and effective."¹

The late Head Master of Uppingham School, the Rev. Edward Thring, who had a thoroughly practical acquaintance with Dr. Pick's system, expressed his opinion of it, in 1887, as follows:—

"The whole of my working life as a learner of new things has been turned round and doubled in efficiency since I heard Dr. Pick. Had I known as a boy how to work in the manner I now do from having listened to his instructions, I should have mastered and retained ten times as much knowledge as I now have with a quarter of the labour. Dr. Pick's method has the marvellous advantage of being the right method for acquiring all knowledge, the true way to apply mind, whilst it also has a few simple but all-powerful rules by which the learning anything by heart is rendered possible and lasting."

Professor Weber, late Director of the Preceptors' College in Bremen, referring to one of Dr. Pick's lectures which he attended, remarked that, "to every one who attended the lecture, it was rendered manifest that to strengthen the memory, and procure results seemingly impossible, one should recur to the aid of this method, and to no other. Its advantages in connection with education were at once made evident to all present; and I do not hesitate to express the opinion that this method should be adopted in all public establishments of education."

Of the numerous testimonials which Dr. Pick has received and published expressing emphatically the strong approval of his method of teaching, nearly all are from first-class educationalists. This fact deserves especial attention; for as these men have the most practical knowledge and the largest educational experience of methods, they are of all men the most competent to appreciate and judge of the special merits of each, and therefore to pronounce the most trustworthy opinions concerning them.

The question may be reasonably asked, if Dr. Pick's method of teaching and of training the memory possesses the special excellence alleged by the witnesses just quoted, how is it that throughout the long period since he began to advocate it its merits are not even yet generally recognized? The answer to this question lies, we believe, in the fact that, though at different times and in various places Dr. Pick has expounded his views, he has not made it the business of his life, as many men in his position would have done, to exemplify their value and importance, by himself becoming the systematic and practical exponent, as a daily teacher, whose lessons would have been accessible to every one wishing to profit by them.

We learn from a pamphlet, entitled *Loisette's Art of Never Forgetting compared with Mnemonics*, by Mr. F. Appleby, how popular Dr. Pick's method has become even in the disguised and greatly impaired form in which Mr. Loisette has presented it. We use these adjectives advisedly, and are justified in doing so by the statements in the pamphlet just mentioned. Mr. Appleby says:—

"Dr. Pick defined the laws governing the reproduction of ideas as being those of analogy, opposition, co-existence, and succession; Mr. Loisette calls this 'recollective analysis,' and gives the laws as 'inclusion,' 'exclusion,' and 'concurrence.' The first, 'inclusion,' is merely the law of analogy under another name. Pick says regarding this: 'Analogous ideas reproduce each other, and are those which have one or more qualities in common.' Mr. Loisette gives exactly the same meaning to the law of 'inclusion,' although, as usual, in different words. He says: 'Inclusion indicates that there is an overlapping of meaning between two words, or that there is a prominent idea or sound that belongs to both alike. In associating the words 'ladder' and 'lad,' he says, 'it is inclusion by sound—"lad" being common to both.' Dr. Pick defined the law of opposition as those containing qualities wholly different from or opposed to each other. Mr. Loisette calls this law 'exclusion,' and defines it as meaning antithesis. In giving examples Mr. Loisette instances 'righteous—wicked,' 'hot—cold,' 'old—young.' One of Dr. Pick's pupils, Rev. J. H. Bacon, gives 'virtue—vice,' 'light—darkness,' 'old—young,' as examples of this rule. Dr. Pick's third law of 'co-existence' he defines as that of the recalling of ideas which at some former period have been in the mind at one and the same time. Mr. Loisette terms 'concurrence' what has been thought of together. Dr. Pick's fourth law of 'succession,' termed by others 'cause and effect,' is really included in the third law, and Mr. Loisette discards it. Mr. Loisette's example of this rule—'walnut-tree—orchard'—may be compared with a similar example given by Pick—'garden—apple.' Except in name the principles of both systems appear to be the same.

"Mr. Loisette's list of one hundred words, referred to above, had, like that of the other mnemonists, to be thoroughly committed to memory. The originality of the method of doing this will be seen from a comparison with other systems. Each of the words in Mr. Loisette's 'correlator' has some connection with that preceding and following it. Mr. Loisette is careful to impress upon his pupils that they are committing to memory, not by repetition, but by analysis, and directs them how to take two words at a time and by comparison or analysis associate them. For instance, the words 'plow' and 'sword' are to be placed in the mind together and associated, or, to use the Professor's term, 'correlated.' Next the word 'sword' is placed in the mind with 'fish;' then 'fish' with 'scales,' followed by 'scale—ladder,' 'ladder—lad,' &c. By learning the series in this manner, and by repeating each set of ten backwards and forwards, the pupil finds that he can repeat the whole in a similar manner. In his book on *Rational Memory*, Dr. Pick gives several lists of words relating to each other, and it is interesting, when considering Mr. Loisette's claim to originality, to peruse the instructions Dr. Pick gave for committing to memory lists of this character. He says, under the heading of 'Association of Ideas': 'When we compare two ideas, we search out and place side by side the qualities which they possess in common, and those on the other hand by which they are distinguished from each other.'

"Now, this operation involves an effort of the mind, and produces an attention which inevitably strengthens the impression, and if at any subsequent period either one of the two ideas which have thus been

compared and analyzed presents itself to the mind, it will recall the other immediately and distinctly. Now, if there be a series of such analogous or opposite ideas which it is desired to retain by heart, the rule just described still holds good, and the task will be found easy if set about with care and deliberation. Merely compare the first idea with the second, the second with the third, and so on; no more than two ideas, however, being taken up at the same time.' The Doctor gives examples, and adds that if care has been taken to associate in the manner described, the student will not only be able to recite the words in the list in their proper order, but will find that any one word will immediately recall the one preceding and following, and that he can with equal facility recite them backwards as forwards.

"It has already been shown how closely Mr. Loisetle has imitated Dr. Pick's principles and method of associating ideas; and a number of instances have been given of Mr. Loisetle's method of connecting two unfamiliar words by a series of disjointed intermediates. In the *English Mechanic*, No. 1081, an 'Old Pupil' of Dr. Pick says: 'Pick's method was to connect two ideas, in themselves unconnected, by some idea which had a connection with each—e.g., to connect "tooth" and "friend." You think of tooth—toothpick—Pick—your friend. Sometimes he carried the connection through a whole series of objects; thus, to connect "coal" and "time:" coal—fire; chimney—chimney-piece; timepiece on it—time.'"

Whereas Dr. Pick says that this (connecting two unfamiliar words) occurs very seldom practically, as every subject we study consists of ideas logically connected, and all we have to do is to start from what we know already, and to compare the new things with the ones we know already, Mr. Loisetle's whole system consists in this correlation, as he calls it; and to show the absurdity to which he turned it, we give here a few instances of his correlations:—

"How to learn history: History of the English people.

"The English people came originally from Denmark. They consisted of three tribes—the Jutes, the English, and the Saxons. Their common name (the English) indicates their unity, and the prominence of one tribe.

"To remember this phrase, you proceed as follows:—

"*The English people* . . . English . . . English lion . . . den.

"*Denmark* . . . Jutland . . . Jutes . . . coarse-cloth . . . sack-cloth . . . Saxons . . . Saxhorn . . . Thrilling . . . note . . . tingle.

"*English common name* . . . unity . . . prominence of one tribe."

"Mr. Appleby's appreciation of Mr. Loisetle's pretensions is confirmed by Mr. Middleton, who says:—

"About four years ago Loisetle, an American lecturer on mnemonics, commenced business in London, teaching what he termed 'instantaneous memory,' and 'the art of never forgetting.' The system subsequently received the approval of Dr. Wilson, and Mr. R. A. Proctor, the astronomer. The fee for a complete course is fifteen guineas, five guineas being charged for imparting the system proper; and additional fees of five guineas each for a 'whist memory,' and the 'cure of discontinuity.' Having received repeated inquiries regarding the merits of this system, I have taken the trouble to carefully compare it with other systems, with the result that I certainly cannot endorse either the Professor's claim or Mr. Proctor's testi-

. . . to its originality. . . . Mr. Proctor says he believes it is unlike all other systems. . . . After a careful comparison of this system with that of Dr. Pick, Miles, Beniorowski, Stokes and others, the conclusion I came to was that, while it in some respects resembles all of them, it is inferior to any one of them. . . . Loisetle, rather curiously, is the only mnemonist who condemns Pick by name and yet adopts Pick's method of association."

We are credibly informed that "Professor" Loisetle's success in teaching his "art of never forgetting" has been so great that the accumulated fees he has received already amount to a large fortune. Perhaps this custom, rigorously observed, of constraining each of his pupils to sign an agreement that they will not reveal a knowledge of his method to any one was a form of homage—questionable, it may be, but none the less real—to Dr. Pick, whose ideas he thoroughly appreciated, and it seems so completely assimilated, that he came to regard them as his own, and accordingly strove to secure for himself an exclusive property in them as if they really were so. Original ideas generally pass, during their struggle for existence, through three phases: (1) their value is ignored; (2) their originality is disputed, and attempts, more or less successful, are made to misappropriate them; and (3) their value and originality are alike recognized and are duly ascribed to their real authors. Dr. Pick's have already passed through the second phase, and now at length he has the satisfaction of seeing them enter the third.¹

P.S.—Since this article has been put into type we have received from the United States a closely printed pamphlet, consisting of 224 pages, entitled "*Loisetle Exposed*."² It appears that "Professor Loisetle" left the scene of his money-making exploits in London some time ago, and went to New York for the purpose of repeating them in Transatlantic cities: He spent many thousands of dollars in advertising himself, and effected an arrangement with a thoroughly astute American, Mr. R. F. Foster, who agreed to "run" him through the chief cities of the Union. According to a deed signed by the two contracting parties, Foster was to be employed in the business of teaching the "Loisetlian System of Memory," or the "Art of Never Forgetting," and was to travel for the purpose of organizing classes in the different cities of the United States. He was to receive for his services 20 per cent. of the total amount derived from each of

¹ The truth of this statement receives abundant confirmation from the excellent, especially erudite, and, for the most part, thoroughly scientific treatise on *Memory*, by Mr. David Kay. His chapters entitled respectively, "Memory, what it is," "Association of Ideas," and "Memory; how to improve it," teem with evidence proving the soundness of each of the propositions of Dr. Pick, the chief of which he quotes in support of his own case.

² "*Loisetle Exposed*" (Marcus Dwight Larrowe, alias Silas Holmes, alias Alphonse Loisetle) together with Loisetle's complete system of Physiological Memory; the Instantaneous Art of Never Forgetting. To which is appended a Bibliography of Mnemonics, 1825-1888. By G. S. Fellows, M.A. Copyright, 1888. New York: G. S. Fellows & Co.

the classes of pupils which he organized, after the expense of organizing it had been deducted. During the fourteen weeks from December 10, 1887, to March 16, 1888, ~~classes~~ were, it appears, organized in five cities, including Washington, D.C., the aggregate number of pupils being 5692; and it is estimated that the total net gains from the enterprise during the fourteen weeks in question were \$22,500. "Of this Loiset^{te} received about \$18,000, and Foster \$4500, besides expenses." Unfortunately, when the Loiset^{tian} lectures came to be delivered at Washington, the progress of this lucrative business was suddenly stopped. The coming of "Professor" Loiset^{te} to Washington was preceded by vague rumours that the Professor was a "fraud." Suspicion gave rise to investigation, and it was discovered that the essential elements of the "Loiset^{tian} system" had been taken bodily, without acknowledgment, from the writings of Dr. Pick. At Washington "a public meeting of all who had studied the Loiset^{te} system" was convened for the purpose of considering Professor Loiset^{te}'s pretensions. The demonstration that the "rumours" mentioned above were thoroughly well grounded is said to have been "complete," and Mr. Foster, whose temptation to remain with Loiset^{te}, with whom he had a contract for four years, consisted of his experience of receiving "over \$50 a day," felt himself constrained to resist that temptation, and to write to his employer the following letter:—

"908, MADISON AVENUE, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND,
"25th April, 1888

"PROFESSOR A. LOISLTTE,

"DEAR SIR,—I wish to say to you that for some time past I have felt alarm regarding the character of the man I have been engaged in introducing to the public.

"... I have for some time been aware of rumours that he was living under a false name, and that the whole account of himself was a series of falsehoods and misrepresentations. I have also been at some pains to investigate his career from the time he was at Yale College to the time he was engaged at the Polytechnic in London; and the general result, coupled with my own experience of him, has been such that I must decline, on moral grounds, to have anything further to do with him, as I do not propose to be caught in the branches when the tree falls. It has never yet been necessary for me to earn a livelihood by misrepresentation or fraud, and I decline to continue in any capacity which compels me to present and introduce to the public as a scholar, a gentleman, and a leader in the cause of education, one whom I know to be a humbug and a fraud.

"Respectfully,
"R. F. FOSTER."

We may add that, according to "*Loisette's Exposed*," Professor Loiset^{te} is an assumed name, and that the person who assumed it is stated to be "Marcus Dwight Larrowe, born at Cohocton, Steuben Co., N.Y., May 5th, 1832."

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by men of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

MARRIAGE.

It is not difficult to find people mild and easy-going about religion, and even politics may be regarded with wide-minded tolerance; but broach social subjects, and English men and women at once become alarmed and talk about the foundations of society and the sacredness of the home! Yet the particular form of social life, or of marriage, to which they are so deeply attached, has by no means existed from time immemorial; in fact, modern marriage, with its satellite ideas, only dates as far back as the age of Luther. Of course the institution existed long before, but our particular mode of regarding it can be traced to the era of the Reformation, when commerce, competition, the great *bourgeois* class, and that remarkable thing called "Respectability," also began to arise.

Before entering upon the history of marriage, it is necessary to clear the ground for thought upon this subject by a protest against the careless use of the words "human nature," and especially "woman's nature." History will show us, if anything will, that human nature has an apparently limitless adaptability, and that therefore no conclusion can be built upon special manifestations which may at any time be developed. Such development must be referred to certain conditions, and not be mistaken for the eternal law of being. With regard to "woman's nature," concerning which innumerable contradictory dogmas are held, there is so little really known about it, and its power of development, that all social philosophies are more or less falsified by this universal though sublimely unconscious ignorance.

The difficulties of friendly intercourse between men and women are so great, and the false sentiments induced by our present system

so many and so subtle, that it is the hardest thing in the world for either sex to learn the truth concerning the real thoughts and feelings of the other. If they find out what they mutually think about the weather it is as much as can be expected—consistently, that is, with genuine submission to present ordinances. Thinkers, therefore, perforce take no count of the many half-known and less understood ideas and emotions of women, even as these actually exist at the moment, and they make still smaller allowance for potential developments which at the present crisis are almost incalculable. Current phrases of the most shallow kind are taken as if they expressed the whole that is knowable on the subject.

There is in fact no social philosophy, however logical and far-seeing on other points, which does not lapse into incoherence as soon as it touches the subject of women. The thinker abandons the thought-laws which he has obeyed until that fatal moment; he forgets every principle of science previously present to his mind, and he suddenly goes back centuries in knowledge and in the consciousness of possibilities, making schoolboy statements, and “babbling of green fields” in a manner that takes away the breath of those who have listened to his former reasoning, and admired his previous delicacies of thought-distinction. Has he been overtaken by some afflicting mental disease? Or does he merely allow himself to hold one subject apart from the circulating currents of his brain, judging it on different principles from those on which he judges every other subject?

Whatever be the fact, the results appear to be identical. A sudden loss of intellectual power would have exactly this effect upon the opinions which the sufferer might hold on any question afterwards presented to him. Suddenly fallen from his high mental estate, our philosopher takes the same view of women as certain Indian theologians took of the staple food of their country.¹ “The Great Spirit,” they said, “made all things, except the wild rice, but the wild rice came by chance.” The Muse of History, guided by that of Science, eloquently protests against treating any part of the universe as “wild rice;” she protests against the exclusion of the ideas of evolution, of natural selection, of the well-known influence upon organs and aptitudes of continued use or disuse, influence which every one has exemplified in his own life, which every profession proves, and which is freely acknowledged in the discussion of all questions except those in which woman forms an important element. “As she was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be——!”

There is a strange irony in this binding of women to the evil results in their own natures of the restrictions and injustice which they have suffered for generations. We chain up a dog to keep watch over our home; we deny him freedom, and in some cases, alas! even sufficient exercise to keep his limbs supple and his body in health.

¹ See Tylor's *Primitive Culture*.

He becomes dull and spiritless, he is miserable and ill-looking, and if by any chance he is let loose, he gets into mischief and runs away. He has not been used to liberty or happiness, and he cannot stand it.

Humane people ask his master: "Why do you keep that dog always chained up?"

"Oh! he is accustomed to it; he is suited for the chain; when we let him loose he runs wild."

So the dog is punished by chaining for the misfortune of having been chained, till death releases him. In the same way we have subjected women for centuries to a restricted life, which called forth one or two forms of domestic activity; we have rigorously excluded (even punished) every other development of power; and we have then insisted that the consequent adaptations of structure, and the violent instincts created by this distorting process, are, by a sort of compound interest, to go on adding to the distortions themselves, and at the same time to go on forming a more and more solid ground for upholding the established system of restriction, and the ideas that accompany it. We chain, because we *have chained*. The dog must not be released, because his nature has adapted itself to the misfortune of captivity.

He has no revenge in his power; he must live and die, and no one knows his wretchedness. But the woman takes her unconscious vengeance, for she enters into the inmost life of society. *She* can pay back the injury with interest. And so she does, item by item. Through her, in a great measure, marriage becomes what Milton calls "a drooping and disconsolate household captivity," and through her influence over children she is able to keep going much physical weakness and disease which might, with a little knowledge, be readily stamped out; she is able to oppose new ideas by the early implanting of prejudice; and, in short, she can hold back the wheels of progress, and send into the world human beings likely to wreck every attempt at social reorganization that may be made, whether it be made by men or by gods.¹

Seeing, then, that the nature of women is the result of their circumstances, and that they are not a sort of human "wild rice," by chance or special creation, no protest can be too strong at the unthinking use of the term "woman's nature." An unmanly host of begged questions, crude assertions, and unsound halions thought are packed into those two hackneyed words.

Having made this protest, we propose to take a brief *journal* the history of marriage, then to consider marriage at the *which* really

¹ With regard to the evil effects of ignorance in the management of your *social* probably few people realize how much avoidable pain is endured, and *weakness* in after-life is traceable to the absurd traditional modes of treatment *though* and children.

The current ideas are incredibly stupid; one ignorant nurse hands another, and the whole race is brought up in a manner that offends *women* scientific acumen, but the simplest common-sense.

day, and finally to discuss the marriage of the future. We begin with a time when there was no such thing as monogamy, but it is not necessary for our purpose to dwell upon that age. The first era that bears closely upon our subject is the matriarchal age, to which myths and folk-lore, in almost all countries, definitely point. The mother was the head of the family, priestess, and instructress in the arts of husbandry. She was the first agriculturist, the first herbalist, the initiator (says Karl Pierson) of all civilization. Of this age many discoveries have lately been made in Germany. The cave in which the mother took shelter and brought up her family was the germ of our "home." The family knew only one parent: the mother; her name was transmitted, and property—when that began to exist—was inherited through her, and her only. A woman's indefeasible right to her own child of course remained unquestioned, and it was not until many centuries later that men resorted to all kinds of curious devices with a view of claiming authority over children, which was finally established by force, entirely irrespective of moral right.

The idea of right always attaches itself in course of time to an established custom which is well backed up by force; and at the present day even persons of high moral feeling see no absurdity in the legal power of a man to dispose of his children contrary to the will of their mother. Not only does the man now claim a right to interfere, but he actually claims sole authority in cases of dispute. This would be incredible were it not a fact.

During the mother-age, some men of the tribe became wandering hunters, while others remained at home to till the soil. The hunters, being unable to procure wives in the woods and solitudes, used to make raids upon the settlements and carry off some of the women. This was the origin of our modern idea of *possession* in marriage. The woman became the property of the man, his own by right of conquest. Now the wife is his own by right of law.

It is John Stuart Mill, we believe, who says that woman was the first being who was enslaved. A captured wife probably lost her liberty even before animals were pressed into man's service. In Germany, and early times, women were in the habit of dragging the plough. These and many similar facts, we may remark in passing, show that which is no inherent difference in physical strength between the two sexes, and that the present great difference is probably induced by the divergence of occupation extending backward over many thousands of years.

In their transition period from the mother-age to the father-age was suffered painful. It took centuries to deprive the woman of her position as head of the family, and of all the superstitious influence which her knowledge of primitive arts and of certain herbs, besides her influence as priestess, secured her.

Of this long struggle we find many traces in old legends, in folklore, and in the survival of customs older than history. Much later, in the witch-persecutions of the Middle Ages, we come upon the remnants of belief in the woman's superior power and knowledge, and the determination of man to extinguish it.¹ The awe remained in the form of superstition, but the old reverence was changed to antagonism. We can note in early literature the feeling that women were evil creatures eager to obtain power, and that the man was nothing less than a coward who permitted this low and contemptible influence to make way against him.

During the transition period, capture-marriages, of course, met with strenuous opposition from the mother of the bride, not only as regarded the high-handed act itself, but also in respect to the changes relating to property which the establishment of father-rule brought about. Thus we find a hereditary basis for the (no doubt) divinely instilled and profoundly natural repugnance of a man for his mother-in-law! This sentiment can claim the authority of centuries and almost equal rank as a primitive and sacred impulse of our nature with the maternal instinct itself. Almost might we speak of it tenderly and mellifluously as "beautiful."

On the spread of Christianity and the ascetic doctrines of its later teachers, feminine influence received another check. "Woman!" exclaims Tertullian with startling frankness, "thou art the gate of hell!" This is the key-note of the monastic age. Woman was an ally of Satan, seeking to lead men away from the paths of righteousness. She appears to have succeeded very brilliantly! We have a century of almost universal corruption, ushering in the period of the Minnesingers and the troubadours, or what is called the age of chivalry. In spite of a licentious society, this age has given us the precious germ of a new idea with regard to sex-relationship, for art and poetry now began to soften and beautify the cruder passion, and we have the first hint of a distinction which can be quite clearly felt between love as represented by classical authors and what may be called modern, or romantic, love—as a recent writer named it. This nobler sentiment, when developed and still further inwoven with ideas of modern growth, forms the basis of the ideal marriage, which is founded upon a full attraction and expression of the whole nature.

But this development was checked, though the idea was not destroyed, by the Reformation. It is to Luther and his followers that we can immediately trace nearly all the notions that now govern the world with regard to marriage. Luther was essentially coarse and irreverent towards the oppressed sex; he placed marriage on the lowest possible platform, and, as one need scarcely add, he did not take women into counsel in a matter so deeply concerning them. In the age of chivalry the marriage-tie was not at all strict, and

¹ *Sex-Relations in Germany.* By Karl Pierson.

our present ideas of "virtue" and "honour" were practically non-existent. Society was in what is called a chaotic state; there was extreme licence on all sides, and although the standard of morality was far severer for the woman than for the man, still she had more or less liberty to give herself as passion dictated, and society tacitly accorded her a right of choice in matters of love. But Luther ignored all the claims of passion in a woman; in fact, she had no recognized claims whatever; she was not permitted to object to any part in life that might be assigned her; the notion of resistance to his decision never occurred to him—her rôle was one of duty and of service; she figured as the legal property of a man, the safeguard against sin, and the victim of that vampire "Respectability" which thenceforth was to fasten upon, and suck the life-blood of all womanhood.

The change from the open licence of the age of chivalry to the decorum of the Philistine régime, was merely a change in the mode of licentiousness, not a move from evil to good. Hypocrisy became a household god; true passion was dethroned, and with it poetry and romance; the commercial spirit, staid and open-eyed, entered upon its long career, and began to regulate the relations of the sexes. We find a peculiar medley of sensuality and decorum: the mercenary spirit entering into the idea of marriage, women were bought and sold as if they were cattle, and were educated, at the same time, to strict ideas of "purity" and duty, to Griselda-like patience under the severest provocation. Carried off by the highest bidder, they were gravely exhorted to be moral, to be chaste, and faithful and God-fearing, serving their lords in life and in death. To drive a hard bargain, and to sermonize one's victims at the same time, is a feat distinctly of the Philistine order. With the growth of the commercial system, of the rich burgher class, and of all the ideas that thrive under the influence of wealth when divorced from mental cultivation, the status of women gradually established itself upon this degrading basis, and became fixed more and more firmly as the *bourgeois* increased in power and prosperity.

Rebel speaks of Luther as the interpreter of the "healthy sensualism" of the Middle Ages.¹ Any "healthy sensualism," however, which did not make itself legitimate by appeal to the Church and the law was rigorously punished under his system. Women offenders were subject to hideous and awful forms of punishment. Thus we may say that Luther established, in the interests of sensuality and respectability, a strict marriage system. He also preached the devastating doctrine which makes it a duty to have an unlimited number of children. Of course he did not for a moment consider the woman in this matter; why should a thick-skinned, coarse-fibred monk of the sixteenth century consider

¹ Rebel on Woman.

The Westminster Review.

sufferings which are overlooked by tender-hearted divines of the nineteenth century? The gentle Melancthon on this subject says as follows: "If a woman becomes weary of bearing children, that matters not; let her only die from bearing, she is there to do it." This doctrine is not obsolete at the present day. It is the rule of life among the mass of our most highly respectable classes, those who hold the scales of public morality in their hands, and whose prerogative appears to be to judge in order that they be not judged.

As an instance of the way in which an exceptionally good man can regard this subject—his goodness notwithstanding—we may turn to the Introduction, by Charles Kingsley, to Brook's *Fool of Quality*, which Kingsley edited. A short account is given of the life of Brook, who flourished (in a very literal sense) in the time of the Restoration, and who was saved, as his biographer points out in joy and thankfulness, from the vices of that corrupt age, by an early marriage. Kingsley goes on to describe the home where all that is commendable and domestic reigned and prospered. He dwells lovingly on that pleasant picture of simple joys and happy cares, upon the swarms of beautiful children who cluster round their father's knee and rescue him from the dangers of a licentious age. Kingsley mentions, just in passing, that the young wife watches the happy scene from a sofa, having become a confirmed invalid from the number of children she has borne during the few years of her married life. But what of that? What of the anguish and weariness, what of the thousand painful disabilities which that young woman has suffered before her nature yielded to the strain—disabilities which she will have to bear to her life's end? Has not the valuable Brook been saved from an immoral life? (Of course Brook could not be expected to save himself!—we are not unreasonable.) Have not Propriety and Respectability been propitiated? And the price of all this? Merely the suffering and life-long injury of one young woman in a thoroughly established and "natural" manner; nothing more. Kingsley feels that it is cheap at the price. *Brook is saved! Hallelujah!*

It is difficult to think without acrimony of the great reformer, conscious though we may be of the untold benefits which he has bestowed upon mankind. It is because of Luther that women are martyred daily in the interests of virtue and propriety! It is to Luther that we owe half the inconsistencies and cruelties of our social laws, to Luther that we owe the extreme importance of the marriage-rite, which is to make the whole difference between terrible sin and absolute duty.

"The Catholic Church had before Luther taught that marriage was a sacrament. We should be the last to defend the truth of such a conception, but we call attention to the fact that it emphasized something beyond the physical in the conjugal relation; it endowed it with a spiritual

side The conception of marriage as a spiritual as well as physical relation seems to us the essential condition of all permanent happiness between man and wife. The intellectual union superposed on the physical is precisely what raises human above brute intercourse. . . . We believe that the spiritual side must be kept constantly in view if the sanctity of marriage is to be preserved. Here it is that Luther, rejecting the conception of marriage as a sacrament, rushes, with his usual impetuosity, into the opposite and more dangerous extreme."¹

Luther in destroying the religious sanctity of marriage destroyed also the idea of spiritual union which the religious conception implied; he did his utmost to deprive it of the elements of real affection and sympathy, and to bring it to the very lowest form which it is capable of assuming. It was to be regarded merely as a means of avoiding general social chaos; as a "safeguard against sin;" and the wife's position—unless human laws have some supernatural power of sanctification—was the most completely abject and degraded position which it is possible for a human being to hold.

That Luther did not observe the insult to womanhood of such a creed is not to be wondered at, since the nineteenth century has scarcely yet discovered it. Of course from such ideas spring rigid ideas of wifehood. Woman's chastity becomes the watch-dog of man's possession. She has taken the sermon given to her at the time of her purchase deeply to heart, and chastity becomes her chief virtue. If we desire to face the matter honestly, we must not blink the fact that this virtue has originally no connection with the woman's own nature; it does *not* arise from the feelings which protect individual dignity. The quality, whatever be its intrinsic merits, has attained its present mysterious authority and rank through man's monopolizing jealousy, through the fact that he desired to "have and to hold" one woman as his exclusive property, and that he regarded any other man who would dispute his monopoly as the unforgivable enemy. From this starting point the idea of a man's "honour" grew up, creating the remarkable paradox of a moral possession or attribute, which could be injured by the action of some other person than the possessor. Thus also arose woman's "honour," which was lost if she did not keep herself solely for her lord, present or to come. Again, we see that *her* honour has reference to some one other than herself, though in course of time the idea was carried further, and has now acquired a relation with the woman's own moral nature, and a still firmer hold upon the conscience. However valuable the quality, it certainly did not take its rise from a sense of self-respect in woman, but from the fact of her subjection to man.

While considering the development of this burgher age, one must not forget to note the concurrence of strict marriage and systematic or legalized prostitution. The social chaos of the age of chivalry

¹ Martin Luther; his Influence on the Material and Intellectual Culture of Germany.—The Westminster Review. New Series, No. CXXIX., July, 1889, pp. 22-9.
VOL. 130.—NO. 2.

was exchanged for comparative order, and there now arose a hard-and-fast line (far more absolute than had existed before in Germany) between two classes of women: those who submitted to the yoke of marriage on Luther's terms, and those who remained on the other side of the great social gulf, subject also to stringent laws, and treated also as the property of men (though not of *one* man). We now see completed our own way of settling the relations of the sexes. The factors of our system are: respectability, prostitution, strict marriage, commercialism, unequal moral standard for the two sexes, and the subjection of women.

In this brief sketch we have not dwelt upon the terrible sufferings of the subject sex through all the changes of their estate; to do so in a manner to produce realization would lead us too far afield and would involve too many details. Suffice it to say that the cruelties, indignities, and insults to which women were exposed are (as every student of history knows) hideous beyond description. In Mongolia there are large cages in the market-place wherein condemned prisoners are kept and starved to death. The people collect in front of these cages to taunt and insult the victims as they die slowly day by day before their eyes. In reading the history of the past, and even the literature of our own day, it is difficult to avoid seeing in that Mongolian market-place a symbol of our own society, with its iron cage, wherein women are held in bondage, suffering moral starvation, while the thoughtless gather round to taunt and to insult their lingering misery. Let any one who thinks this exaggerated and unjust, note the manner in which our own novelists, for instance, past and present, treat all subjects connected with women, marriage, and motherhood, and then ask himself if he does not recognize at once its ludicrous inconsistency and its cruel insults to womanhood, open and implied. The very respect, so called, of man for woman, being granted solely on condition of her observing certain restrictions of thought and action dictated by him, conceals a subtle sort of insolence. It is really the pleased approval of a lawgiver at the sight of obedient subjects. The pitiful cry of Elsie in *The Golden Legend* has had many a repetition in the hearts of women age after age—

“ Why should I live? Do I not know
The life of woman is full of woe!
Toiling on, and on, and on,
With breaking heart, and tearful eye,
And silent lips, and in the soul
The secret longings that arise
Which this world never satisfies!”

So much for the past and its relation to the present. Now we come to the problem of to-day. This is extremely complex. We have a society ruled by Luther's views on marriage; we have girls

brought up to regard it as their destiny ; and we have, at the same time, such a large majority of women that they cannot all marry, even (as I think Miss Clapperton¹ puts it) 'if they had the fascinations of Helen of Troy and Cleopatra rolled into one. We find, therefore, a number of women thrown on the world to earn their own living in the face of every sort of discouragement. Competition runs high for all, and even were there no prejudice to encounter, the struggle would be a hard one ; as it is, life for poor and single women becomes a mere treadmill. It is folly to inveigh against mercenary marriages, however degrading they may be, for a glance at the position of affairs shows that there is no reasonable alternative. We cannot ask every woman to be a heroine and choose a hard and thorny path when a comparatively smooth one, (as it seems), offers itself, and when the pressure of public opinion urges strongly in that direction. A few higher natures will resist and swell the crowds of worn-out, underpaid workers, but the majority will take the voice of society for the voice of God, or at any rate of wisdom, and our common respectable marriage—upon which the safety of all social existence is supposed to rest—will remain, as it is now, the worst, because the most hypocritical, form of woman-purchase. Thus we have on the one side a more or less degrading marriage, and on the other side a number of women who cannot command an entry into that profession, but who must give up health and enjoyment of life in a losing battle with the world.

Bebel is very eloquent upon the sufferings of unmarried women, which must be keen indeed for those who have been prepared for marriage and for nothing else, whose emotions have been stimulated and whose ideas have been coloured by the imagination of domestic cares and happiness. Society, having forbidden or discouraged other ambitions for women, flings them scornfully aside as failures when through its own organization they are unable to secure a fireside and a proper "sphere" in which to practise the womanly virtues. Insult and injury to women is literally the key-note and the foundation of society.

Mrs. Augusta Webster amusingly points out the inconsistencies of popular notions on this subject. She says:—"People think women who do not want to marry unfeminine ; people think women who do want to marry immodest ; people combine both opinions by regarding it as unfeminine for women not to look forward longingly to wifehood as the hope and purpose of their lives, and ridiculing and condemning any individual woman of their acquaintance whom they suspect of entertaining such a longing. They must wish and not wish ; they must by no means give, and they must certainly not withhold, encouragement—and so it goes on, each precept cancelling the last, and most of them negative." There are, doubt-

¹ *Scientific Meliorism.* * By Jane Hume Clapperton.

less, equally absurd social prejudices which hamper a man's freedom, by teaching girls and their friends to look for proposals, instead of regarding signs of interest and liking in a more wholesome spirit. We shall never have a world really worth living in until men and women can show interest in one another, without being driven either to marry or to forego altogether the pleasure and profit of frequent meeting. Nor will the world be really a pleasant world while it continues to make friendship between persons of opposite sexes well-nigh impossible by insisting that they *are* so, and thereby in a thousand direct and indirect ways bringing about the fulfilment of its own prophecy. All this false sentiment and shallow shrewdness, with the restrictions they imply, make the ideal marriage—that is, a union prompted by love, by affinity or attraction of nature and by friendship—almost beyond the reach of this generation. While we are on this part of the subject it may be worth while to quote a typical example of some letters written to Max O'Rell on the publication of *The Daughters of John Bull*. One lady of direct language exclaims fiercely, "Man is a beast!" and she goes on to explain in gleeful strains that, having been left a small fortune by a relative, she is able to dispense with the society of "the odious creature." Of course Max O'Rell warmly congratulates the "odious creature." "At last," another lady bursts forth, "we have some one among us with wit to perceive that the life which a woman leads with the ordinary sherry-drinking, cigar-smoking husband is no better than that of an Eastern slave. Take my own case, which is that of thousands of others in our land. I belong to my lord and master, body and soul; the duties of a housekeeper, upper nurse, and governess are required of me; I am expected to be always at home, at my husband's beck and call. It is true that he feeds me, and that for his own glorification he gives me handsome clothing. It is also true that he does not beat me. For this I ought, of course, to be duly grateful; but I often think of what you say on the wife and servant question, and wonder how many of us would like to have the cook's privilege of being able to give warning to leave."

If the wife feels thus we may be sure the husband thinks he has his grievances also, and when we place this not exaggerated description side by side with that of the unhappy plight of bored husbands commiserated by Mrs. Lynn Linton, there is no escaping the impression that there is something very "rotten in the state of Denmark." Amongst other absurdities, we have well-meaning husbands and wives harassing one another to death for no reason in the world but the desire of conforming to current notions regarding the proper conduct of married people. These victims are expected to go about perpetually together, as if they were a pair of carriage-horses; to be for ever holding claims over one another, exacting or making useless sacrifices, and generally getting in one another's way.

The man who marries finds that his liberty has gone, and the woman exchanges one set of restrictions for another. She thinks herself neglected if the husband does not always return to her in the evenings, and the husband and society think her undutiful, frivolous, and so forth if she does not stay at home alone, trying to sigh him back again. The luckless man finds his wife so *very* dutiful and domesticated, and so *very* much confined to her "proper sphere," that she is, perchance, more exemplary than entertaining. Still, she may look injured and resigned, but she must not seek society and occupation on her own account, adding to the common mental store, bringing new interest and knowledge into the joint existence, and becoming thus a contented, cultivated, and agreeable being. No wonder that while all this is forbidden we have so many unhappy wives and bored husbands. The more admirable the wives the more profoundly bored the husbands!

Of course there are bright exceptions to this picture of married life, but we are not dealing with exceptions. In most cases, the chain of marriage chafes the flesh, if it does not make a serious wound; and where there is happiness the happiness is dearly bought and is not on a very high plane. For husband and wife are then apt to forget everything in the absorbing but narrow interests of their home, to depend entirely upon one another, to steep themselves in the same ideas, till they become mere echoes, half creatures, useless to the world, because they have run into a groove and have let individuality die. There are few things more stolidly irritating than a very "united" couple. The likeness that may often be remarked between married people is a melancholy index of this united degeneration.

We come then to the conclusion that the present form of marriage—exactly in proportion to its conformity with orthodox ideas—is a vexatious failure. If certain people have made it a success by ignoring those orthodox ideas, such instances afford no argument in favour of the institution as it stands. We are also led to conclude that modern "Respectability" draws its life-blood from the degradation of womanhood in marriage and in prostitution. But what is to be done to remedy these manifold evils? how is marriage to be rescued from a mercenary society, torn from the arms of "Respectability," and established on a footing which will make it no longer an insult to human dignity?

First of all we must set up an ideal, undismayed by what will seem its Utopian impossibility. Every good thing that we enjoy to-day was once the dream of a "crazy enthusiast" mad enough to believe in the power of ideas and in the power of man to have things as he wills. The ideal marriage then, despite all dangers and difficulties, should be *free*. So long as love and trust and friendship remain, no bonds are necessary to bind two

people together ; life apart will be empty and colourless ; but whenever these cease the tie becomes false and iniquitous, and no one ought to have power to enforce it. The matter is one in which any interposition, whether of law or of society, is an impertinence. Even the idea of "duty" ought to be excluded from the most perfect marriage, because the intense attraction of one being for another, the intense desire for one another's happiness, would make interchanges of whatever kind the outcome of a feeling far more passionate than that of duty. It need scarcely be said that there must be a full understanding and acknowledgment of the obvious right of the woman to *possess herself* body and soul, to give or withhold herself body and soul exactly as she wills. The moral right here is so palpable, and its denial implies ideas so low and offensive to human dignity, that no fear of consequences ought to deter us from making this liberty an element of our ideal, in fact its fundamental principle. Without it, no ideal could hold up its head. Moreover, "consequences" in the long run are never beneficent, where obvious moral rights are disregarded. The idea of a perfectly free marriage would imply the possibility of any form of contract being entered into between the two persons, the State and society standing aside, and recognizing the entirely private character of the transaction.

The economical independence of woman is the first condition of free marriage. She ought not to be tempted to marry, or to remain married, for the sake of bread and butter. But the condition is a very hard one to secure. Our present competitive system, with the daily increasing ferocity of the struggle for existence, is fast reducing itself to an absurdity, woman's labour helping to make the struggle only the fiercer. The problem now offered to the mind and conscience of humanity is to readjust its industrial organization in such a way as to gradually reduce this absurd and useless competition within reasonable limits, and to bring about in its place some form of co-operation, in which no man's interest will depend on the misfortune of his neighbour, but rather on his neighbour's happiness and welfare. It is idle to say that this cannot be done ; the state of society shows quite clearly that it *must* be done sooner or later ; otherwise some violent catastrophe will put an end to a condition of things which is hurrying towards impossibility. Under improved economical conditions the difficult problem of securing the real independence of women, and thence of the readjustment of their position in relation to men and to society would find easy solution.

When girls and boys are educated together, when the unwholesome atmosphere of social life becomes fresher and nobler, when the pressure of existence slackens (as it will and *must* do), and when the whole nature has thus a chance to expand, such additions to the scope and interest of life will cease to be thought marvellous or "unnatural." "Human nature" has more variety of powers and

is more responsive to conditions than we imagine. It is hard to believe in things for which we feel no capacity in ourselves, but fortunately such things exist in spite of our placid unconsciousness. Give room for the development of individuality, and individuality develops, to the amazement of spectators! Give freedom in marriage, and each pair will enter upon their union after their own particular fashion, creating a refreshing diversity in modes of life, and consequently of character. Infinitely preferable will this be to our own gloomy uniformity, the offspring of our passion to be in all things exactly like our neighbours.

The proposed freedom in marriage would of course have to go hand-in-hand with the co-education of the sexes. It is our present absurd interference with the natural civilizing influences of one sex upon the other, that creates half the dangers and difficulties of our social life, and gives colour to the fears of those who would hedge round marriage with a thousand restraints or so-called safeguards, ruinous to happiness, and certainly not productive of a satisfactory social condition. Already the good results of this method of co-education have been proved by experiment in America, but we ought to go farther in this direction than our go-ahead cousins have yet gone. Meeting freely in their working-hours as well as at times of recreation, men and women would have opportunity for forming reasonable judgments of character, for making friendships irrespective of sex, and for giving and receiving that inspiring influence which apparently can only be given by one sex to the other.¹ There would also be a chance of forming genuine attachments founded on friendship; marriage would cease to be the haphazard thing it is now; girls would no longer fancy themselves in love with a man because they had met none other on terms equally intimate, and they would not be tempted to marry for the sake of freedom and a place in life, for existence would be free and full from the beginning.

The general rise in health, physical and moral, following the improvement in birth, surroundings, and training, would rapidly tell upon the whole state of society. Any one who has observed carefully knows how grateful a response the human organism gives to improved conditions, if only these remain constant. We should have to deal with healthier, better equipped, more reasonable men and women, possessing well-developed minds, and hearts kindly disposed towards their fellow-creatures. Are such people more likely to enter into a union frivolously and ignorantly than are the average men and women of to-day? Surely not. If the number of divorces did not actually decrease there would be the certainty that no couple

¹ Mr. Henry Stanton, in his work on *The Woman Question in Europe*, speaks of the main idea conveyed in Legouvé's *Histoire des Femmes* as follows:—"Equality in difference is its key-note. The question is not to make woman a man, but to complete man by woman."

remained united against their will, and that no lives were sacrificed to a mere convention. With the social changes which would go hand in hand with changes in the status of marriage, would come inevitably many fresh forms of human power, and thus all sorts of new and stimulating influences would be brought to bear upon society. No man has a right to consider himself educated until he has been under the influence of cultivated women, and the same may be said of women as regards men.¹ Development involves an increase of complexity. It is so in all forms of existence, vegetable and animal; it is so in human life. It will be found that men and women as they increase in complexity can enter into a numberless variety of relationships, abandoning no good gift that they now possess, but adding to their powers indefinitely, and thence to their emotions and experiences. The action of the man's nature upon the woman's and of the woman's upon the man's, is now only known in a few instances; there is a whole world yet to explore in this direction, and it is more than probable that the future holds a discovery in the domain of spirit as great as that of Columbus in the domain of matter.

With regard to the dangers attending these readjustments, there is no doubt much to be said. The evils that hedge around marriage are linked with other evils, so that movement is difficult and perilous indeed. Nevertheless, we have to remember that we now live in the midst of dangers, and that human happiness is cruelly murdered by our systems of legalized injustice. By sitting still circumspectly and treating our social system as if it were a card-house which would tumble down at a breath, we merely wait to see it fall from its own internal rottenness, and *then* we shall have dangers to encounter indeed! The time has come, not for violent overturning of established institutions before people admit that they are evil, but for a gradual alteration of opinion which will rebuild them from the very foundation. The method of the most enlightened reformer is to crowd out old evil by new good, and to seek to sow the seed of the nobler future where alone it can take root and grow to its full height: in the souls of men and women. Far-seeing we ought to be, but we know in our hearts right well that fear will never lead us to the height of our ever-growing possibility. Evolution has ceased to be a power driving us like dead leaves on a gale; thanks to science, we are no longer entirely blind, and we aspire to direct that mighty force for the good of humanity. We see a limitless field of possibility opening out before us; the adventurous spirit in us might leap up at the wonderful romance of life! We recognize that no power, however trivial, fails to count in the general sum of things which moves this way or that—towards

¹ Mrs. Cady Stanton believes that there is a sex in mind, and that men can only be inspired to their highest achievements by women, while women are stimulated to their utmost only by men.

heaven or hell, according to the preponderating motives of individual units. We shall begin, slowly but surely, to see the folly of permitting the forces of one sex to pull against and neutralize the workings of the other, to the confusion of our efforts and the checking of our progress. We shall see, in the relations of men and women to one another, the source of all good or of all evil, precisely as those relations are true and noble and equal, or false and low and unjust. With this belief we shall seek to move opinion in all the directions that may bring us to this "consummation devoutly to be wished," and we look forward steadily, hoping and working for the day when men and women shall be comrades and fellow-workers as well as lovers and husbands and wives, when the rich and many-sided happiness which they have the power to bestow one on another shall no longer be enjoyed in tantalizing snatches, but shall gladden and give new life to all humanity. That will be the day prophesied by Lewis Morris in *The New Order*—

"When man and woman in an equal union
Shall merge, and marriage be a true communion."

MONA CAIRD.

MR. WHISTLER'S "TEN O'CLOCK."

in the younger days of Chicago getting into difficulty with a policeman in one of the "lots" which were in process of being converted into a park, because, overcome by a midday sultriness, I had committed the enormity of falling asleep on a bench provided apparently only for persons maintaining a demurely erect sitting posture. I succeeded, however, in appeasing this grim custodian of public decency; he even became sociable, and proceeded to explain to me what he considered to be the duties of his calling: how important it was for a great town such as Chicago to preserve a proper decorum in its public places; the more so as its citizens, being still of somewhat a frontier type, could not fall asleep without exhibiting the natural looseness of deportment from which they were restrained only by continual effort, assisted by a consciousness of their increasing importance in the world. His respect for me greatly rose when he heard I came from New York; for, in his capacity of park policeman, he had conceived a high regard for that city of the Union, which was admitted to have the largest and finest park in the country. "And have you seen Central Park?" said he, lowering his voice. I admitted, not without some self-consciousness, that I had. "And"—continued he with bated breath, his words reduced almost to a whisper—"and is it well policed?"

All the cities of America had for this park policeman only one interest—their parks; and those parks only one merit—"were they well policed?"

Now, it is very rare that an artist can be induced to lay bare his notions—when he has any notions at all—about his work. But when he does, and when he is almost as gifted in the form he can give to his words as he is in the harmony he can give to his colour, how delicious a treat it is, and how much it reminds one of my Chicago Park policeman.

The world is to Mr. Whistler as an artist what it was to him as a policeman; he can see nothing in it but Art.

But I feel that I ought to go no further without apologizing for having only to-day for the first time read the words of my wayward and, I fear, by this time, demonetized countryman, Mr. Whistler. I see that the second of three fly-pages is devoted to the announcement that these words were:

"Delivered in London, February 20, 1885. At Cambridge, March 24. At Oxford, April 30."

My first excuse, however, is to be found in the first page of the first fly-leaf, which is immaculate save for the following: "Mr. Whistler's *Ten o'Clock*, London, 1888;" and a device, which, from its reappearance immediately after the eloquent words of the peroration, was doubtless amongst those worthy to be "broidered with the birds, upon the fan of Hokusai, at the foot of Fusi-yama." I have no doubt the device is very beautiful, but I do not venture to reproduce it, as it may be the composition of Mr. Whistler, and I see that the second page of the first fly-leaf is entirely consecrated to the usual warning: "The rights of translation and reproduction are reserved."

Ten o'Clock seems therefore to have remained confined to the breasts of the author and those who heard him on the 20th of February 1885, in London, March 24 at Cambridge, and April 30 at Oxford, until it was published in London, 1888. I will confess that I had not heard of it at all until I read Mr. Swinburne's article on it in the *Fortnightly Review*, and I became immediately possessed of a burning desire to know whether the literature of this quite gifted person was as puzzling as his art.

Moreover, I have often tried to induce artists to tell me something of their aims, their intentions, their standard; what made them paint a particular picture; what in their minds went to make up its success or failure; and apart from such answers as are too obvious for reproduction I never got anything better than that made by Mr. Sargent when asked what induced him to paint his "Gipsy Dance," a picture that certainly attracted more interest than any other in the Paris Salon of 1882. As far as I can remember, his words were: "I felt an irresistible desire to paint it." He even generalized his statement, and decided that he never had painted anything—portraits excepted—unless under the pressure of an irresistible impulse. I was beginning to frame a theory on the subject when *Ten o'Clock* came into my hands: here was the utterance of one who—if rumour told aright—could talk as well as paint. And what does this artist-preacher say?

He opens with much modesty—he himself calls it "timidity;" but the breath of his apology is still hot in the air when he admits the "efficient effrontery" that must be expected from any one who undertakes to "talk about Art." Nor does he leave us long in any suspense as to which is his assumed and which his real manner. After a charming defence of his goddess against those who would profane her by asking the "people . . . to love art and to live with it," and a quite new description of her as "withal selfishly occupied with her own perfection only—having no desire to teach," he suddenly

drops the last rag of coyness and in all the nakedness of the Olympian gods delivers the oracle as follows:—

“Listen,” says he.

“Listen. There never was an artistic period. There never was an Art loving nation.” . . . The artists “went beyond the slovenly suggestion of Nature and the first vase was born in beautiful proportion.”

“And the toilers tilled and were athirst; and the heroes returned from fresh victories, to rejoice and to feast; and all drank alike from the artists’ goblets, fashioned cunningly, taking no note the while of the craftsman’s pride, and understanding not his glory in his work; drinking at the cup, not from choice, not from a consciousness that it was beautiful, but because, forsooth, there was none other.

“And time, with more state, brought more capacity for luxury, and it became well that men should dwell in large houses, and rest upon couches, and eat at tables; whereupon the artist, with his artificers, built palaces, and filled them with furniture, beautiful in proportion and lovely to look upon.

“And the people lived in marvels of art—and ate and drank out of masterpieces—for there was nothing else to eat and to drink out of, and no bad building to live in; no article of daily life, of luxury, or of necessity, that had not been handed down from the design of the master, and made by his workmen.

“And the people questioned not, *and had nothing to say in the matter.*

“So Greece was in its splendour, and Art reigned supreme—by force of fact, not by election—and there was no meddling from the outsider.

* * * * *

“But there arose a new class who discovered the cheap, and foresaw fortune in the facture of sham.

* * * * *

“Then sprang into existence the tawdry, the common, the gew-gaw.

* * * * *

“And the artist’s occupation was gone, and the manufacturer and the huckster took his place.

* * * * *

“And the people—this time—had much to say in the matter—and all were satisfied. And Birmingham and Manchester arose in their might, and Art was relegated to the curiosity shop.”

* * * * *

I am sorry to have to borrow so much of Mr. Whistler’s lecture, but I am afraid to put this theory in my own words, lest I should fail to convey the real meaning of the passage, and lest those who had not read or heard *Ten o’Clock* should decline to believe that any such words could have been written by a sane man.

Not that the story he tells of the invasion of Birmingham and Manchester may not be deplorably true; but that there never was an “art-loving nation,” that there was no love of art outside the makers of works of art in Greece during the life of Phidias, or in Italy during that of Michael Angelo; that Pericles and Aspasia drank out of artistically fashioned vessels, “because, forsooth, there was none other,” and that the Medici in adorning their palaces with painting and statuary “questioned not *and had nothing to say in the matter*”—(this last italicized, mind you, in the original)—this I

dared not say in any words save those of him who has not hesitated to proclaim himself "preacher" as well as artist.

It is true that this seems much too funny to be very misleading, and does not impose upon the "unattached writer," for whom our artist-preacher affects a contempt which he is too much of an unattached writer himself to feel, the duty of exposure which would be incumbent upon him, were the fallacies at all covered or concealed; but Mr. Swinburne, with a scalpel so adroit that, while it exposes the heart of the disease, leaves the person operated under the pleasing impression that the knife has done no more than agreeably tickle the surface, has barely touched upon this part of the lecture, and although his allusion to the "witty tongue thrust into the smiling cheek" doubtless covers this passage, he by omission leaves the unwary to imagine from the seriousness of Mr. Whistler's tone that he really means in this instance what he says, whereas this is one of our artist-preacher's most sublime, because most outrageous, witticisms.

That he should have dared stand up before not only the most cultured audience of London—but, heaven save the mark!—of Cambridge and Oxford also—and, without a smile, perpetrated upon them a practical joke at which all Olympus must have roared, raises Mr. Whistler almost to the rank of Oscar Wilde.

But while London and Oxford and Cambridge may allow themselves to be amused with gentle and even unsmiling satisfaction by the paradoxes of this new apostle, the young land of America, less sophisticated, may stand before this farrago of wit and wisdom, gaping like a country bumpkin at a circus, marvelling at the blows which the master of the ring gives the clown, the clown gives the pantaloon, and pantaloon passes on to the stable-boy—not laughing at all—but thinking it very serious and almost tragic earnest.

So when our simple citizens are told, in accents of contempt, that "we have come to hear of the painting that elevates, and of the duty of the painter—of the picture that is full of thought, and of the panel that merely decorates,"

he may seriously believe that he has been sadly mistaken about art: that art is only for artists, and that he, *profanum vulgus*, must hereafter consent to take—and pay for—whatever Mr. Whistler may offer and demand; not because it is beautiful—for it may not be beautiful—but because Birmingham and Manchester having been disposed of by the Whistlerian decree, "there will be none other," and because "they have nothing to say in the matter." This will puzzle our simple citizens; all the more because they will say: If Mr. Whistler was really joking when he wrote this, why did he write so cleverly about Nature's rôle in Art, and so reverently about Art herself? They will hardly be satisfied with the answer that this was the talk of the juggler to keep the mind of his audience occupied while he was exorcising his jokes past the critical epiglottis, so

the whole dose was swallowed—Art and Nature, artist elect and *vulgus profanum*, Birmingham and Manchester, Rembrandt's needle and Beethoven's O minor symphony, the marbles of the Parthenon and the fan of Hokusai, and found full of deliciously complicated flavours. They will not want to believe that Mr. Whistler is a humorist at all, and will cling, I fear, to the possibly unfair conviction that, with all his artist's skill, he has painted some very foolish pictures, and with all his preacher's rhetoric, he has indulged in some very foolish talk.

What they will ultimately decide will perhaps depend upon our gifted countryman's future work, whether, as he exhorts us, we wait until he paints again as when he drew his mother's outline, or, with less timidity and perhaps at a less fashionable hour, he deigns to explain the beauty and the cost of his symphonies in grey.

But out of the very extravagances of Mr. Whistler we have much to learn. For on two points, almost if not quite as humorous as those already referred to, I believe him to be sincerely convinced. These points are: That the one touch of Nature that makes the whole world kin in Art is—vulgarity; and that the story of the beautiful is equally well told in the marbles of the Parthenon and upon the fan of Hokusai. The reason why I believe him to be convinced on these points is that, in the first place, if we rightly apprehend the artist's vocation in this century of ours, he can hardly hold any other creed; and in the second place, because both these theories have been repeatedly urged, sometimes in less, sometimes in more, bold language by a school of artists to which Whistler belongs, or to which he is at least strongly affiliated. Oscar Wilde, at once the apostle and *enfant terrible* of the so-called, though wrongly so-called, æsthetic movement, claims that a well-lacquered Japanese box is artistically as great as the frescoes of the Sistine Chapel; this is an Oscar Wildeish way of saying that the theme of the artist is indifferent provided he does his work well. On the other hand, Mr. Sargent, who represents quite another order of talent, whether as regards artistic discrimination or artistic sincerity, shows his horror of what Mr. Whistler stigmatizes as vulgarity, but he himself more politely calls commonplace, by the strange and unaccustomed postures and effects which, during the latter part of his stay in Paris, characterized his style until it reached its climax in the portrait of M^{me}. Gauthereau—the last slap he threw in the face of the Parisian public, which he holds in, perhaps, too ill-concealed a contempt.

That these theories are widely held is too true for us to pass the fact over without scrutiny, especially if it turn out that there is in this fact much that will throw light upon the relation of Art to humanity in these days of ours; for I venture to believe that, if we examine this question without indignation at finding ourselves included among the "outsiders," the "amateurs," the "dilettantes,"

for which Mr. Whistler tells us Art does not exist at all, and without disregard for the shortcomings in ourselves which perhaps justify some, if not all, of Mr. Whistler's reproaches, we may discover that the sterility of Art to-day is our own fault wholly, and not that of the artist, who asks nothing more than to be given something worth painting, whose whole function in life is to put into artistic expression those things which are nearest and dearest to our hearts. If the hearts of some of us are wholly occupied by the accumulation of wealth, those of others with the accumulation of facts, those of others with the pursuit of pleasure, and those of the rest with providing for their bodily needs—what is there for any one to say to them, whether it be in Poetry, in Music, or in Art?

I am aware that this notion of Art is to Mr. Whistler a heresy, but it is one which he may pardon me when he finds me attributing all the shortcomings of Art to ourselves. It may be worth while, for the better understanding of this view, to pause one moment, and consider just what Art is.

I do not want to attempt to exhaust in a definition this much disputed question. I am anxious only to point out that aspect of Art as to which it is material to this discussion that there should be no mistake. It seems to me, then, that if we take a comprehensive view of the various methods which man has invented for expressing at once his thoughts, his feelings, and his aspirations, it will be found that Art is no other thing than one of them. His thoughts are most directly expressed in language; but his emotions, too subtle, and perhaps too great, for simple expression in words of definite and precise meaning, have sought to reveal themselves in the fanciful innuendoes of Poetry, the vagueness and spirituality of Music, the forms and colour of Art. Each of these methods of expression is particularly suited to the emotion it is best suited to express. Hence the justice of Mr. Whistler's complaint at the invasion of Art by Literature; hence the fact, that the greatest works of art leave those who best understand them incapable of expressing in any other language exactly what the artist has revealed upon his canvas. Pater has, it is true, told in language full of poetry and conviction, much that he has seen in the works of the Renaissance; but he would be the last to pretend that he had told us all that is to be seen there. He has only told us a part, and a very small part, of it; for if he had told us all, or nearly all, it would be needless to visit the pictures themselves. And yet his work does nothing if it does not fire the heart of his readers with a longing to see the things which he attempts to describe. So also no description, however literary or poetic, can replace the hearing of Beethoven's Symphonies; it is the hearing of them we long for, just as the seeing only of the "Gioconda" would satisfy those who once had read the burning pages of Pater's Essays.

So the story that the poet tells us should be told by the poet only, and that which the artist tells us by the artist only, and that which the musician tells us by the musician only. Not but what each may illustrate the other's work; but he must confine himself to illustrating—he must not attempt to invade it. This is little more than a condensation of the pages of Lessing's *Laocoon*, where it can be read to better effect than here.

Now if Art is only one of several modes of expression, what shall we say of one who should tell us that Art has nothing to do with expression at all; that the theme is immaterial provided the form be correct; that a Japanese lacquered box is artistically as great as the frescoes of the Sixtine Chapel, or, as Mr. Swinburne puts it, one who "concedes to Greek art a place beside Japanese?" what shall we say if such a one be admittedly an artist who, with some startling and lamentable exceptions, has himself painted with consummate skill, with "intense pathos of significance and tender depth of expression?"

Mr. Whistler is not always humorous; nor is he at all insane. He is essentially an artist, with the instincts of an artist; in his heart troubled and yet affecting to be gay; asking himself why Art is such a dead thing to-day, and, after finding an answer in the dead hearts of those around him, refusing to credit that answer; giving heed to the unintelligent instinct in him that bids him paint for the mere sake of painting, regardless of the vulgarity of those for whom he paints, regardless of whether he sculpt in marble or broider a fan, so that he ends by a wilful though almost unconscious self-deception into believing that "Art and Joy go together," that—

"Our tears have been cozened from us falsely, for they have called out woe when there was no grief—and, alas! where all is fair."

But Art and Joy do not always go together; there is still grief among us, and, alas! all is not fair.

There are few things of any importance in this world that Art can touch without either elevating or profaning them. No one who has seen the "Coronation of the Virgin," by Sandro Boticelli, in Florence, or the "Sistine Madonna" in Dresden, or Michael Angelo's "Pietà" in Rome, can fail to admit that Christianity has been enhanced by these supreme works of art in the hearts of all who have seen them; on the other hand, by giving to Christ the head of a fanatic—terribly earnest and sincere but no less a fanatic—and by painting the story of his trial with a truth that reduces what imagination has pictured as one of the most tragic incidents in history to the dead level of an ordinary though somewhat riotous appearance before a magistrate, Munkacsy has done more to destroy the Divinity of Christ in our hearts than all the venom of Voltaire.

What is wanting in Art to-day is not imagination—not technique; it is the spirit that gave a text to the artist in the artistic periods,

which Mr. Whistler is so sure never existed. All Art is more or less a culture of Love; in Greek Art it was Love in the perfection of human form; in the Renaissance it was Love in the tragedy of human sacrifice; but to-day there seems little of Love left to us save that which sprang from the commerce of the young god with the earthly Psyche—Voluptas. In our greed for accumulating riches, our eager pursuit of pleasure, our very avidity for the knowledge that educates the mind, divorced from any attempt at the same time to reach the wisdom that elevates the heart and soul, we leave nothing for the artist to do save perhaps to "broider the fan of Hokusai at the foot of Fusi-yama." The artist, the while, is unconscious of his own misfortune. Feeling in his finger ends the capacity for any work, however difficult and however high, he is puzzled to find how far his work falls short of that which at certain periods has preceded him. It is as though a great musician stood before a complete instrument, with full consciousness of the capacities of the instrument to speak and of his own capacity to make it speak, and yet without a note of music before his eyes or in his heart; a poet with Swinburne's gift of rhythm and nothing to say.

Of one who uses language in plain prose we demand thought; of one who uses it in poetry we may ask for thought but can only demand fancy; but of one who uses music and painting we should not ask for thought at all, but feeling. If thought be there and it take not the form of literary invasion, it may not disgrace and may enhance the work; but in the greatest works of art thought is conspicuous by its relative absence; they are essentially expressions of the heart and soul.

If there is nothing in us from whom artists spring and for whom they paint, the expression of which we can demand or they can supply, whose is the fault?

Is not this generation indeed essentially "vulgar," and if it is, what is left for the artist but to paint for Art's sake? Is it not a marvel that he should continue to paint at all; and if he can consider Art a sufficient end in itself, is it not well that he should do so waiting the time, when, having passed through this period of purely intellectual progress, we shall have attained that level which will waken to other and perhaps higher claims.

¶ We have then but to wait as Mr. Whistler tells us; but we have to wait until there come to us one who, "with the mark of the gods upon him," will accomplish something better—not, shall I say, than the fan of Hokusai, but even than the marbles of the Parthenon; who, taking up the story of our martyrdom at the disconsolate figures that weep at the tomb of the Medicis, will reveal to us, whether with chisel or brush, in poetry or in music, the hopes and aspirations that are the motives of all true Art, and without which Art is reduced to mere mimicry.

EDMOND KELLY.

COMMON SENSE: A NEMESIS.

A FALSE idea of matter—one inevitable up to a certain phase of culture—is the main cause of a certain insubordination to common sense and a consequent penalty of which this article treats. The idea is false in two respects—First, as supposing matter to be solid; secondly, as supposing it to have no attributes but those symbolized by the idea. No law of thought requires that solidity is essential to matter. An entity, whether solid or not solid, extended or inextended, mobile or immobile, divisible or indivisible, if it have the property of causing a sensation that tends to pass for solidity, is all that the laws of thought require in a material thing. A universe of non-solid entities qualified to cause sensation would not necessarily differ as to appearance and behaviour from Cosmos such as it seems to us. From this point of view it is manifest that the ordinary definition of matter—that which will have it to be solid, extended, inert, mobile, and divisible—*begs* what scrutiny finds to be inadmissible. A definition better accommodated to our knowledge and ignorance respecting the thing called matter is this:—*Matter is entity, either solid or qualified to be an unintentional cause, or part of an unintentional cause, of sensation.* As regards the second fallacy in the common idea of matter, it is responsible for the error that a material thing could not be either a subject or a cause of consciousness. Being nothing more than solid extended, &c., it could not be such a subject or cause. But what hinders, or in any way discredits, the supposition of an inextended—a spiritual—subject of consciousness being qualified to be an unintentional cause of visual and tactile sensation, or a part of such a cause? There is no inconsistency in the idea of a concrete so qualified, nor can Imagination invent a history too sublime to be the history of such a concrete. It might be what is commonly called an atom, and might, in connection with other atoms constituting an organism, be a mind and a free agent—a Socrates, a Cæsar, a Shakespeare. Before this idea of matter, vanishes the speciosity that matter and consciousness are essentially alien to one another; that there can subsist between them no relation of subject and attribute; and that, therefore, philosophy is bound to reject a theory

which affirms that no reality corresponds to the mental symbol of matter.

Another cause of refractoriness is ignorance ~~that~~^{of} the substantive nature of the Ego is demonstrable. To quell this cause of disturbance, I proceed to *demonstrate* that the Ego is a substance; and I begin with an exposition of what is denoted by the name substance. Consider the axiom of Spinoza: "A thing is either in itself or in something else." Now, a thing that is in itself, and is not, like space and time, a vacant entity, is a substance. What is necessarily in something else is an attribute. This was clearly the mind of Aristotle when he defined *Ousia*, or substance, as being entity that is not predicable. Only things to which it is essential to be *in* other things, *in* them in the sense of being dependent on them for existence, only these things—whereof the common name is attribute—are predicable. Entities opposed to attributes, things-in-themselves, are not predicable. Accordingly, Aristotle divided Entity into Substance and Attribute, Thing-in-itself, and Thing-not-in-itself, Thing not predicable, and Thing predicable. He overlooked Time and Space. Space, though not a substance, is (if it exist) a thing-in-itself, and Time (allowing its existence) is certainly not in anything else, and is not a substance. Had they not been overlooked, Aristotle would in all probability have divided Entity into Impredicables and Predicables, and Impredicables into vacant Impredicables and Substance.¹ Aristotle held substances to be concrete individuals—*e.g.*, Socrates, agreeing in this respect with the great bulk of men, with common sense; and those who, like Duns Scotus, perverted the term substance, making it denote a somewhat bearing to Attributes, such a relation as that of a pincushion to the pins stuck in it, wrought mere confusion. A substance, then, is a non-vacant entity, to which it is not essential to be in another thing. In brief, it is a thing-in-itself that is not vacant.

Now, the cardinal immediate object of apperception is an entity. (I do not imply that it is a *reality*. It may be either a real or an unreal entity. Entities essentially connected with discernments are unreal, those that are not are real.) The cardinal immediate object of apperception, self, as being non-vacant, is either a substance or an attribute of one. If it be a substance the apperception is true; for it apprehends the object as being a substance. If the object be an attribute of a substance it is also a symbol of the substance, and, in either case, the veracity of the apperception as regards reference to a substantive object is guaranteed by inconsistency of the opposite. It may not, perhaps, be obvious that if the immediate object be an attribute of a substance, it is therefore necessarily a symbol of the

¹ This is the division made by *The Alternative*, except that Impredicables are called fundamental ultimates.

substance, and necessarily a true symbol. I shall try to make this plain. A certain apperception is an attribute of the substance A, and its cardinal immediate object is given to it as being the substance whereby it is apperceived, as being A. By means of the attribute, including its unreal object, A discerns himself, is the remote object corresponding to the unreal immediate object of the apperception. This unreal object, therefore, is symbolic, and truly symbolic of an apperceiving substance; its truth as symbol is guaranteed by inconsistency of the opposite. The truth of apperception, then, in so far as it gives self as being a substance, is guaranteed by the principle of contradiction. It is inconsistent to allow the existence of apperception and deny that of substance—of personal substance. When, by-and-by, we find Fichte asserting that the Ego is an activity which posits itself, and M. Renouvier that it is a mere bundle of phenomena, our guaranteed knowledge that it is a substance will cancel the assertions.

Philosophy affects axiom and demonstration, and distrusts unguaranteed natural data¹ and induction. In Plato we find it disparaging as "mere opinion" all belief not guaranteed by inconsistency of the opposite, and confining the name "knowledge" to guaranteed belief.² The philosophic instinct in Descartes groped along the way of doubt for guaranteed knowledge. Common sense, on the other hand, is tenacious of the whole of the foundation of belief, of the unaxiomatic as well as the axiomatic part of it. When Science emerges from Philosophy it grounds itself, except as to mathematics, mainly on unaxiomatic data and induction, using deduction merely as an auxiliary of induction; it leaves philosophy in the region of axiom and pure deduction. This gives philosophy and science the air of moving in different planes, not accidentally, but by necessity of their nature. It seems as though philosophic speculation must confine itself to the sphere of axiom and pure deduction, and scientific speculation to that of unguaranteed datum, induction, and what may be called impure deduction. Of course, the seeming is merely specious. Nothing hinders philosophy to extend her research where common sense beckons her, along the lines of unguaranteed fundamental data. She would thus renew her old relation to science—that of mother-lye to crystal—with no other difference than this: the relation, formerly hidden, would be obvious. Another accident passes for an essential difference between philosophy and science. Common sense is averse to secular vexed questions, such as that of the origin and destiny of the Universe: what in it is absolute? what contingent?

¹ Data guaranteed by inconsistency of the opposite I distinguish as guaranteed, and their opposites as unguaranteed: knowledge in general is divisible into guaranteed and unguaranteed.

² See *Republic*, Book V. Timæus, Meno, Phædrus, Protagoras, Crito, Laches, Theætetus.

is the first cause spiritual or material, Divine or ~~infernal~~, or neither one or the other? Is man wholly material, or in part a spirit? It is averse, not because those questions are not of legitimate and profound interest to man, but because they do not seem to admit of a solution. It turns from them to questions the hypothetical solutions of which seem to admit of a verification by experience, and have not for ages baffled inquiry. Not even by the squaring of the circle will it be detained. To this aversion of common sense is due the separation of science from philosophy. Philosophy held to the questions which common sense and science tabooed. Then it appeared as though philosophy were essentially incapable of discourse respecting the questions that interest science, and science essentially incapable of discourse respecting the paramount questions of philosophy. If philosophy should hit upon a solution of any of those questions, a solution satisfactory to common sense, that solution would become a constituent of science, and so prove the accidental character of the influence which applies philosophy to one order of questions and science to another. What seems to be required of philosophy is, that it cease to confine itself to axiom and deduction, and practically account the inductive faculty a legitimate and sufficiently secure foundation. It will hold to questions of which science despairs, and take the initiative as regards questions of which science, although they be not ripe for its investigation, is not hopeless—*e g.*, psychology. Now, the main part of the judicial function of common sense, as regards philosophy, is to condemn its aberrations from unguaranteed fundamental data, and, above all, the following: (1) that the Ego is a durable substance; (2) that there exists a substantive not-self including several persons; (3) that either a part or the whole of the substantive universe is material. We have here to do with philosophers who have denied one or other or all of these deliverances, and to show that refractoriness has brought them to grief—wrecked them either upon inconsistency or extreme absurdity. Conspicuous among them are Spinoza, Berkeley, Fichte, Hegel, Schelling. Opposition to what may be called the natural theory of the Universé—theory conformable to fundamental natural data—gathers into a group the doctrines of these philosophers, together with the Neo-Kantianism of our contemporaries both in England and France, the materialism of Mr. George Lewes, and the Mind-stuff hypothesis of Professor Clifford.

In the first part of this article I shall examine the Idealism of Berkeley, expose the baselessness of the division of knowledge into *à priori* and *à posteriori*, and consequently that of the Idealism of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, and then I shall examine the doctrine of M. Charles Renouvier, doctrine known as Phenomenism; the second part will be given to Spinoza; the third to the Materialism of Mr. George Lewes and the Mind-stuff hypothesis.

II.

Of philosophers in revolt against common sense one of the most notable is Berkeley. It had become plain, that colour, sound, odour, flavour, could not exist apart from consciousness, that they could not be qualities of an unconscious thing. Common sense had then assumed them to be effects and symbols of dynamic qualities—powers—of bodies. Accordingly, philosophy had divided the qualities of matter into primary and secondary, the primary being extension, impenetrability, figure, mobility, divisibility, inertness. Berkeley protested that counterparts of the mental symbols of the primary qualities can no more exist out of consciousness than counterparts of colour, sound, odour, flavour, and, on this inverisimilar pretext, denied the existence of matter. Ignoring the fact that *outness* in respect of consciousness, independence as regards existence on consciousness, is essential to what is symbolized by the idea of matter and denoted by the term matter, he usurps the term and applies it to the denotement of a mere mental symbol, maintaining that he means by the term what all the world always meant by it, that in this respect he sides with common sense, and that it is his opponents who are refractory, sceptical. He held that it is essential to matter to be discerned, that it is a mere object—a mere object caused by God in the minds of creatures. No pretext for this wild doctrine would have existed if the definition of matter as being substance either solid or qualified to be an unintentional cause or a part of an unintentional cause of sensation had then obtained. No seeming of inconsistency in the datum that matter exists would have served as a pretext for insurrection against the law of thought under which the datum obtains. Absent, there was nothing to prevent Berkeley from trying conclusions with common sense. According to Berkeley then: Being is comprised by certain inextended persons, one of whom, God, is continually imposing phantasmagorical delusions on the others. The phantasms with which he occupies them Berkeley calls matter. What seems to be the material universe, our bodies, the earth, the sun, planets, stars, lower animals—all is phantasmal. No human action such as phantasmal representation gives as being discernible by sense, is possible. Sometimes, but rarely, when opposition of motives gives opportunity of choice, the human dupe and victim is for an instant active, but choice or volition is not a kind of action which, were there such a thing as sense, would be discernible by sense. There is no such thing as human reaction. Except the occasional and very rare act called volition, the dupe and victim of the divine magic, is passive. Eating, drinking, manual work, reading, writing, speech, social intercommunication, government, legislation, marrying, breeding, the relation of husband and of the parent and child, wealth, art, traffic, birth, death,

contention, are things impossible. What passes for them is mere phantasm, mere delusion. When an infant seems to be born, what really happens is that the inextended person constituting the apparent mother is visited by a phantasm which seems to be her own body bringing forth another human body, and God so connects with this phantasm an inextended person, A; that A seems to the apparent mother to have proceeded from her, and like phantasms pass for the body of A with doctor, nurse, and subsequently with all to whom A is known: throughout, our self-consciousness is duped by such a phantasm and we apperceive ourselves as being either wholly or in part bodies. Our share in what is called a crime is confined to bad surrender to motives all but overwhelming, motives provoked by God: all beside is the phantasmal work of God. We sometimes surrender to such motives in what is remembered as having been a dream.¹ As culpable as such a surrender is, so culpable are we in ordinary cases of crime and no more; for ordinary crime, except the motives and the consent, is phantasmal, like that of a dream. Such is man's part in a crime and all the rest is God's—all the foul detail of adultery, incest, and what are called crimes against Nature. A hypnotizing God and hypnotized creatures comprise the universe of Berkeley. But the crimes in which man participates are trifles compared with those in respect of which the arch-hypnotizer is the sole culprit, the sacrilege against dignity with which he amuses his eternal solitude, the agony imposed upon his human victims in the shape of poverty, disease, famine, war, shipwreck. Wherein does this God of Berkeley differ from an omnipotent devil capable of duping the spirit of holiness with the phantasmal passion-play known as the life of Christ?

Except as regards the existence and nature of God, and the nature of His creatures, Berkeley's hypothesis abolishes Nature and Law and substitutes Miracle. With Nature and Law it abolishes Science. Its substitution of Miracle saves it from inconsistency: the rock on which it splits is extreme absurdity and indecency, not inconsistency.

A prelate more imbued than Bishop Berkeley with the Christian spirit never held the pastoral staff. He saw in his prodigious hypothesis only its starlike nucleus: the tail escaped his view, and not only his, but hitherto that of his disciples and opponents. Not without exception then is the rule referred to by Christ in the deliverance, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

III.

The Neo-Kantianism of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, revived by Green in England and Renouvier in France, is a notable insurgent

¹ The writer remembers a deliberate resistance to such a motive in a dream.

against the dominion of common sense. It is founded on Kant's doctrine of knowledge *à priori*, and collapses if the foundation be shown to be an inconsistency. This I undertake to show.

Had Kant applied himself to the acquisition of a definite idea of experience before he committed himself to the doctrine of knowledge *à priori* it is probable that he would have spared Philosophy the critique of Pure Reason. Even now that idea is a prone postulant at the gates of Philosophy, where it is likely to starve. According to Kant, experience is exclusively conversant about sensation, whereas all the world is agreed that we owe to experience our knowledge of temporal identity—*c.g.* that of our acquaintances; and, in the mental symbol of identity, there is nothing of sensation, nor in the mental symbols of durability, cause, kind, custom, thickness, the life and consciousness of others, the uniformity of Nature. If one will be at pains to read the nineteenth chapter of *L'Alternative*, he will be made aware of a gulf of ignorance respecting the scope of what is denoted by the term experience, a gulf in which the human mind is all but wholly plunged, and he will become alive to the absurdity of dogmatizing about experience before one has emerged from the gulf. He will learn that there is such a thing as latent experience, an experience that causes *unconscious* knowledge—*e.g.* the unconscious knowledge of the natures of certain entities; for instance, that things like those which have satisfied hunger are of a nature to satisfy hunger, that things like those which have been seen undergoing combustion are combustible. Such empirical knowledges obtain at first unconsciously, so far are they from being products of inference, as philosophy has hitherto taken them to be.

Kant pretends that experience *pre*-supposes the ideas of time and space, and therefore he ranks those ideas as *à priori*. A baseless pretext indeed. Experience supposes but does not *pre*-suppose those ideas. Visual or tactile experience of body necessarily involves a mental symbol of space, but the symbol does not precede, it merely accompanies, that of the body, and both symbols are effects of the same cerebral cause.

Axioms are held to be conclusive proofs of knowledge *à priori*; but knowledge of axioms depends on knowledge of their terms, which is the creature of experience. Knowledge of an axiom is a joint product of (1) an attribute of mental structure which constitutes or determines an affection to a certain thesis, and (2) the experiences which acquaint us with the terms of the thesis or their cognates—*e.g.* things, equalities, samenesses, one another, in the axiom, "things equal to the same are equal to one another." And, since axioms depend on experience, deduction depends on it: deduction is as much a derivative of experience as induction.

It has been shown that experience originates the idea of power

Common Sense: a Nemesis.

given as attribute of substance other than *Ego*, and that, in this experience, power is given as being a sensible attribute, one that, like colour, is sensationally discernible, so little was there need of Kant's distortion of psychology to vindicate power against Hume's assault upon it. Hume objected to power that it could not be an object of empirical knowledge. "No," replied Kant, "but it is objective *à priori*." Solidity is not more plainly objective to sense than what is originally given to sense perception as being power. That the datum is only partially true and needs purgation by Reason does not disprove the origination of the idea of power by experience. The idea of the mathematical line originates in a mental symbol caused by lines of two or three dimensions, but so caused that it distinctly symbolizes only one of the dimensions. When Reason discovers the indistinct dimension or dimensions, it purges the idea of the line of the indistinct part or parts. So Reason purges the mental symbol of power of impurities with which primitive experience adulterates it. No idea seems to be more remote from the possibility of an empirical origin than the moral ideal; but I have traced it to its root in experience. I regret that I have not space for an exposition of that connection.

The mental events which seemed to Kant to evince and to be explicable by what he calls categories and forms of sensibility, common-sense explains as being due to qualities of mental structure, and when the dependence of consciousness on corporal causes is ascertained, to organs. The substitution of categories and forms of sensibility, as explanatory factors for mental qualities, should disgrace the critique. It implies that, like Time and Space, they are *vacant* entities, implies that they inhere in the mind, but not as qualities, and that when they are filled with sensation, which they serve to mould, as cups mould the liquid contained in them, they are objective to knowledge as respectively parts of its total objects—surely, a most inverisimilar hypothesis.

Scrutiny finds the reasons of unguaranteed knowledge to be inadequate, and although the laws of belief under which they obtain determine corresponding certitudes, the reasons seem to be rather irrational than rational incentives to belief. This disposes to the judgment that, in so far as reason makes account of them, it is adulterated—is pure only when conversant about guaranteed knowledge and its reasons: hence the *Pure Reason* of Kant. It is clear that the product of Pure Reason, which he calls transcendental knowledge, is simply guaranteed knowledge, knowledge sanctioned by the principle of contradiction. The science of mathematics is the only one worthy the name which Reason *quid* faculty of guaranteed knowledge has achieved. Logic, as having for its foundation a product of mere induction, is not, like mathematics, a guaranteed science. Pure Reason is incapable of a

philosophy explanatory of all entity—of what Kant calls transcendental philosophy. Guaranteed knowledge can attain to no object other than time, Ego, its consciousnesses and their kinds: it necessarily ignores the existence of more than one person.

What Kant calls categories he gleaned inductively, did not deduce from Logic. He surveyed the field of judgments, named the differentia of the most comprehensive kinds, categories, and, *assuming* that his survey was exhaustive, inductively judged that his categories were exhaustive. Like the syllogism, they are unguaranteed by the principle of contradiction. It is true that, if their right to supremacy be not questioned, that principle seems to stigmatize judgments adverse to them, but not if the right be questioned. To scepticism animated by common sense they are objects of faith—of mere faith, not of certitude. Kant has indirectly discredited them by denying the validity of their equivalents, his “forms of sensibility,” to which he pretends are due our ideas of time and space. He deals with them capriciously, now exalting them to the rank of dictators of law to Nature, and now degrading them to that of mere dependents on what he badly calls the categorical imperative, the impersonal imperative called duty.

A pregnant error of Kant, mother of a brood developed in Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and our Neo-Kantian contemporaries, is the doctrine that the cardinal object of apperception, self or Ego, is not a substance, but a mere synthesis of consciousnesses, of perceptions! Before religion, philosophy, and the impotence of the mind to realize that the beloved dead are not alive, attained to the idea of the soul, one's own body is apperceived as being Ego or self, and the bodies of other men are given to sense-perception as respectively comprising their *selves*. When the idea of the soul obtains, the cardinal object of apperception does not vary, Ego or self continues to be, in the view of apperception, the body of the apperipient, but it is *judged* to be a composite of two substances—viz., body and soul. Never, in the view of apperception, is it other than substance—material substance. Reflection, indeed, which has been hitherto mistaken for apperception, may sometimes distinguish Ego as being exclusively the inextended thing called soul or mind, but never apprehends it otherwise than as being a substance, never as being a synthesis. Overlooking the dependence of apperception and memory on bodily structure and function, and that disease and decay sometimes deprive us of both, Kant ascribes to apperception our reference of our consciousnesses to Ego, especially of those that are successive in time. He pretends to explain remembrance by apperception, as though the former were a species of apperception. They resemble each other as regards reference of consciousness to Ego, and remembrance presupposes apperception; but they differ in the respect that apperception is conversant about the present and remembrance about

the past, a difference which Kant's putative explanation fails to explain. Apperceiving people are sometimes devoid of memory. Apperception itself is a mere function of an organ that sometimes ceases to function without interrupting the play of other faculties. The authority of Kant, by licensing such violations of common sense, liberated the Pantheistic Titan or tendency in Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, and eruptions of inconsistency became the vogue in philosophy. The identity of subject and object was proclaimed. Hegel proclaimed the identity of opposites, and that an ever-frustrated becoming excludes Being.¹ Time and space were abolished. The Ego is the fundamental entity; it is self-caused; it is an activity, an activity of nothing; is its own product; in the language of Fichte, posits itself! According to English Neo-Kantianism, there is an absolute self-consciousness that is somehow identical with such contingent self-consciousnesses as those of Tom, Dick, and Harry!

IV.

Of the doctrines of our Neo-Kantian contemporaries that of M. Charles Renouvier seems to me to do least violence to common sense, and is therefore, I presume, the fairest sample I can select from the school, of the frailty of theories at variance with the natural theory of the Universe. Understanding consciousness to be the common name of all sensations, sense perceptions, remembrances, imaginations, questions tacitly put by a mind to itself, judgments, certitudes, opinions, doubts, indeed of all obvious mental events except acts which some of them involve (the understanding supposes that a sensation is a consciousness and that sensations are consciousnesses), this being allowed, the doctrine of M. Renouvier, doctrine known as phenomenism, is truly expressed by the following formula: Consciousnesses, groups of consciousnesses constituting persons, aggregations and segregations of consciousnesses and law according to which these obtain, comprise Being, and none of them are substances; to the mental symbol of substance or Thing-in-itself (Thing opposed to attribute as not being necessarily in something else) no reality corresponds. What are here called "consciousnesses" M. Renouvier calls "phenomena."² Phenomenism presumes that the change which

¹ When certain minds come in view of the instability of body, especially of organic body, discovering that what seemed to be durable body is often a mere flux or series in which there is nothing durable but figure, they are dazed, and rush to the conclusion that instability of body is instability of matter. The appearances that bewilder them are delusive aspects of perdurable matter, of atoms migrating from one durationless body to another. Overlooking the perdurable, nay, the absolute, matter supposed by the delusive appearances, they are swamped by such conclusions as that of Heraclitus and Hegel, or that of the Hindu philosophers, that all is delusion—*Maia*.

² "L'embarras signalé n'existe pas pour l'idéalisme phénoméniste, qui dispose justement du mot *phénomène* pour le service, que M. Clay voudrait obtenir du mot *conscience*. La remarque de ce philosophe, et surtout sa proposition de réforme, sont conçues dans un esprit évidemment phénoméniste."

it proposes to make in the system of common beliefs is not subversive—is a mild reform, not a revolution, rids that system of a mere encumbrance, a mere supernumerary, leaving it mainly as it was: the personal world especially it deems itself to have stripped of nothing worth missing. According to Phenomenism no realities correspond to the mental symbols of time, space, matter, and motion, nor to that of involuntary power. “I allow, on the contrary,” writes M. Renouvier, in answer to certain questions respecting his doctrine, “the will as cause, essentially cause, and sole cause. What I do not allow is that there is an external reality which corresponds to the mental symbol of a force, of a subject agent operative on a subject patient.”¹

In section vi. of his *Traité de Logique Générale, &c.*, M. Renouvier undertakes to prove that there is no such thing as a thing-in-itself, at least that we know of no such thing. The title of the section is “Qu’il N’existe Pas De Chose En Soi Pour La Connaissance.” In the fourteen succeeding sections he goes on to show that space, time, matter, motion, and the sum total of things are not things-in-themselves. The argument, if we hold it to the letter, pretends to prove that *Everything, the sum total of things included, is in something else!* To argue that the sum total of things is not a thing-in-itself is to argue that the sum total of things is in something else. This M. Renouvier argues in section xiv. entitled “Preuve Quant à la Somme Totale Des Phénomènes.” To hold M. Renouvier to this flagrant contradiction would be captious. A remark of his in section vi. shows that the meaning he annexes to the term, thing-in-itself, is only a part of its true meaning, that the term, as he employs it, does not denote a thing unthinkable as being necessarily in another thing, but merely what the term, substance, is commonly understood to denote. The remark to which I refer is this: “J’ai donc prouvé que les représentations seules sont données . . . et que dès lors les choses en soi n’existent pas si ce n’est que les représentations se nomment choses en soi.” Except representations he called things-in-themselves! If we allow that they are not attributes of discerning substances, what else should they be but things-in-themselves—and substances, if substance be held to be the common name of things-in-themselves? But it is not; space is a thing-in-itself, but no one ever thought of calling it a substance. One may hesitate to call time a thing-in-itself, but certainly not to pronounce it a thing that is not in anything else. Time seems to refute Spinoza’s putative axiom, “Whatever is, is in itself, or in another thing.” However that be, no one is of the mind to call time a

¹Admète, au contraire, la volonté comme cause, essentiellement cause, et seule cause. Ce que je n’admets pas, c’est qu’il y ait une réalité externe qui corresponde au symbole mental d’une force qui soit d’un sujet agent pour opérer sur

substance. Doubtless, M. Renouvier employed the term thing-in-itself as synonym of substance, and so committed himself to an appearance of contradiction.

Only three things pretend to the rank of things-in-themselves, and one of them scarcely makes good a title: they are Time, Space, and Substance. Time and space are *vacant* things; substance is a thing that is not vacant. Accordingly, substance may be defined a "thing-in-itself that is not vacant." M. Renouvier had in mind non-vacant entity.

Infinite divisibility and its seeming implication that there is such a thing as infinite number, constitute the putative flaw that serves as pretext to M. Renouvier for abolishing time, space, matter, and motion. The genus, quantity, is comprised by the two sub-genera: quantity that does and quantity that does not involve plurality. A quantity that involves plurality may be called a *plurality*. A finite plurality is what is called a sum. Of infinite pluralities we have an example in the infinitude of the parts of time, or in that of the parts of space. Sums are numbers; but we are often cognizant of sums and ignorant of their numbers. To ascertain the number of a sum exceeding five units we have to count. Counting ascertains the number of a sum by ascertaining the place of the sum on a scale which *The Alternative* distinguishes as *plurive* — the epithet, though barbarous, is indispensable.¹ It should now be plain that an infinite plurality is not a number, is not a sum; that the idea of it is not inconsistent as implying the inconsistency, infinite number. It is essential to number to be finite. The series of possible numbers that compose the "plurive" scale is an infinite plurality, and therefore not a number. So vanishes the pretext of M. Renouvier; and time, space, and matter survive. M. Renouvier will not, I presume, deny the consistency of the idea of infinite plurality.

He argues that infinite divisibility supposes an infinitude of parts. It does not. *There are no such things as infinitesimals*. The idea of infinitesimals, as symbolizing parts that are infinitely divisible, and, nevertheless, the least possible parts of their respective wholes, is inconsistent. It does not symbolize such parts as points, lines, surfaces, instants, whereof no plurality, no quantity, could constitute their respective wholes: it symbolizes parts specifically like their respective wholes, and such parts only. Accordingly, a part of time, space, or matter, specifically like its whole, does not involve an infinitude of parts specifically like their respective wholes, an infinite plurality pretending to be an infinite number, and so serving as an explosive in the hands of phenomenism. Every part of time specifically like its whole involves an infinitude of instants, every part of space specifically like its whole involves an infinitude of points, lines,

¹ *L'Alternative*, § clxviii., § clxli., a, and § clxvii. In *L'Alternative* pluralities are erroneously called sums.

and surfaces; but these, although parts of their respective wholes, are not the parts to which infinite divisibility refers. Instants are mere limits of times, limits that do not interrupt the continuity of time; points and lines are mere limits of spaces that do not interrupt the continuity of space. There are surfaces that may be distinguished as interior, *e.g.*, the surface of a statue in the block: every body contains an infinitude of interior surfaces that do not interrupt the continuity of its extension. There is no such thing as a proximity of instants that excludes intervening instants, no such thing as a proximity of points that excludes intervening points, of lines that excludes intervening lines, of interior surfaces that excludes intervening interior surfaces. These perplexing limits, are they pivots of antinomial inconsistency? By no means. They are perplexing, but not inconsistent. The infinito, whether in the direction of greatness or of littleness, is a perplexity to the faculty of knowledge, but involves nothing objectionable to the principle of contradiction.

The flying arrow of Zeno, at every instant measuring a space equal to its own extension, and therefore judged to be at rest, is applied by M. Renouvier to show that a reality answering to the idea of motion is impossible. This paralogism has been staring discredit at the foundations of human knowledge for thousands of years unrefuted, and the refutation was all the time almost in view. It was hidden by the assumption that an instant is a time. We now know better. We are able to see that *for a solid to measure a space equal to its own extension for an instant, is not necessarily to be at rest: to be at rest, the solid must measure the space during a time.* So vanishes the arrow of Zeno, leaving us free to believe in motion.

Amongst the constituents of persons, M. Renouvier reckons law, particularly a species of law which he calls *function*, and seems to desire that law, as personal constituent, should rank even above phenomena. Commenting on a summary of his doctrine given in a recent treatise, he remarks as follows:—"He," the author of the treatise, "makes me say that the 'Ego is an abstraction,' and that 'there is nothing real but the phenomena which succeed one another.' But my thought, expressed in full in the commencement of my *Premier Essai*, is that there are no more any phenomena without laws which unite and bind them, than there are laws without phenomena. Personality is a law, even a supreme law, the inferior consciousness of which (appetites and perceptions without liberty, which compose the whole of Nature) are but rude outlines. One might say 'there is nothing real but laws,' with as good reason as say 'there is nothing real but phenomena.'"¹ M. Renouvier adds: "Functions (in

¹ "Il me fait dire que, 'le moi est une abstraction,' et 'qu'il n'y a de réel que les phénomènes qui se succèdent.' Mais ma pensée, exposée au long au commencement de mon *Premier Essai*, qu'il n'y a pas plus de phénomènes sans lois qui les unissent et

mathematical sense of the word) and laws are, to my mind, all that there is of intelligible and conscious matter in being."¹ I see with surprise that M. Renouvier predicates of "laws and functions," as though he had not explained function as being a species of law—what he calls "*phénomène-loi*."² Law he defines as follows:—A law is a compound phenomenon, produced or reproduced in a constant manner, and represented as a common relation of the various relations of other phenomena.³ A law a compound phenomenon, produced or reproduced in a constant manner! But a phenomenon so produced or reproduced is produced or reproduced according to law; so that the definition gives law as being a phenomenon that is produced or reproduced according to law! The definition involves another inconsistency. A phenomenon involving a discernment of a law presupposes the law it discerns; for it depends on observation of a regularity that evinces, because it presupposes, the law: to say nothing of a phenomenon in John or James regulating, as law, the play of phenomena—their aggregations and segregations—in other persons. M. Renouvier's idea of law does not seem to be stable. He sometimes mistakes for law the regular series of events whereby law is manifested. Thus, the regular falls of stones which finger and thumb have ceased to uphold he calls a law.

Positivism and common sense are agreed that natural law is a species of necessity, the species by virtue of which regular events obtain; but common sense will have it that the necessity is dynamic, that law is a species of necessary power, and this Positivism denies. It denies with Hume, its founder, that there is such a thing as power. To turn this controversy, I have recourse to a compromise definition, viz.:—A natural law is a necessity, either dynamic or the reverse, in virtue of which a regular succession in time obtains. By the way, it must be allowed to Positivism, that law is not the only kind of impotent necessity. The necessity whereby the parts of time either precede or follow each other is also a kind of impotent necessity; and still another is that necessity manifested by the properties of mathematical figures. Now, impotent necessity is not an explanatory fact, and, as such, inferrible. It is intuitable, and may be conjectured, but cannot be inferred. If certain apparent facts should seem to be inexplicable, except the hypothesis that they obtain by virtue of impotent necessity be counted as explanation, the predicament must fail to elicit an inference that the facts

les relieut que des lois sans phénomènes. La personnalité est une loi, et même la loi suprême, dont les consciences inférieure (appétits et perceptions sans liberté qui composent toute la Nature) ne sont que des ébauches. On pourrait aussi bien dire: *il n'y a de réel que les lois*, que non pas *il n'y a de réel que les phénomènes*.

¹ Les fonctions (au sens mathématique du mot) et les lois sont selon moi tout ce qu'il y a d'intelligible et de matière à connaissance dans l'être.

² See *Traité de Logique Générale*, vol. i. p. 137.

³ "Une loi est un phénomène composé, produit ou reproduit d'une manière constante, et représenté comme un rapport commun des rapports de divers autres phénomènes."

obtained by virtue of impotent necessity—the illative faculty must fail to think impotent necessity into the facts as an explanatory factor. Any thesis having explanatory value, if it be the sole hypothesis in view, is by that fact imposed upon the illative faculty as being true; but the being the sole hypothesis in view fails to confer explanatoriness on the idea of impotent necessity. To offer unintuitable impotent necessity as an explanatory factor, is to baulk a mind hungry for explanation. We are thus baulked by M. Renouvier, when he ascribes his prodigious concurrences of phenomena, whereby they are mutually corroborative, to impotent necessity. The ascription is equivalent to an avowal that the putative facts we would fain have explained are inexplicable. In respect of it, Positivism secures ground and exceeds M. Renouvier. The latter allows voluntary power: Positivism allows no power whatever. Indeed, it implicitly denies the possibility of inductive science; for a science which is a system of explanatory theses, and with power disappears. Explanatoriness as regards change. What are called the inductive sciences are, according to Positivism, mere catalogues, including description of kinds of substances and events.

Phenomenism implies that in a person successive phenomena are united. Succession excludes union: it admits of connection, but not of union. The successive mental events, or consciousnesses, given as being attributes of one and the same person, are given as being connected by the identity of a substance whereof they are attributes; such a connection is intelligible, and the idea of it is satisfactory explanatory to common sense. In ejecting that idea from the system of explanatory factors, Phenomenism implies that there is no such thing as a group of really connected successive phenomena; for it abolishes, as far as explanation is concerned, a condition *sine quid non* of the existence of such a group. Let two groups of simultaneous phenomena be called the one A, the other B, and let B obtain eighty or ninety years after A. It seems to me that A and B are not ideally thinkable as members of a group—of one and the same group—except they be apprehended as attributes of one and the same durable substance. If due experiment by other minds verify this seeming, it must be allowed that groups of successive phenomena are not possible, and that an idea of such a group necessarily symbolizes it as being an attribute, or sum of attributes, of a durable substance. This would show that durable substance is a condition *sine quid non* of psychological explanation; and that the rejection of it, as not being an explanatory factor, as being a mere encumbrance in the region of explanation, is such a mistake as one would make who should undertake to explain the solar system without the sun.

The inventors of unsound hypotheses are prone to avoid the terra

firma of concrete example, and keep on the wing in generalities; of course they do so inadvertently. The marble statue of Condillac is a brave example of the opposite method of philosophizing. It ruined sensationalism by exposing it to easy inspection. If M. Renouvier would undertake to expound phenomenism by means of such a concrete example, it is not improbable that the experiment would convince him of the unsoundness of his hypothesis. Let him explain for instance "phenomenistically" what takes place when an opera is being performed, how this or that apparent tenor is in part constituted at any instant by a discernment of himself—a self-consciousness—as singing this or that note of an aria, how the phenomenon involving this discernment gives way to a phenomenon involving self-consciousness of the tenor as singing the succeeding note, how this gives way and another succeeds, how prior to the singing there was in him an intention to sing that aria involved somehow with a phenomenon having the aria for object, how every member of the audience has discernments of sounds corresponding to those of the tenor, so that they apprehend him as singing that very sound which he apprehends himself as singing. Let him explain the concurrences of phenomena corresponding to what seems to be the issue of a newspaper, and a consequent distribution of the day's news; how like phenomena annex themselves to thousands of men, so that, for the most part, the latter apprehend alike what seem to be the recent notable events. How comes it that thousands of phenomena involving like discernments of like printed signs, and, respectively corresponding to these, objects that pass for the notable events—how comes it, I ask, that such marvellous concurrences obtain? By virtue of impotent necessity? If so the opinion that it is possible for unloaded dice to turn up aces invariably hereafter, except on Sundays, and on Sundays sixes, is quite legitimate.

Phenomenism is driven to commit violence on the terms *subject* and *attribute*, wresting them from their received meanings and imposing on them meanings which have scarce any analogy with the former. It will have a phenomenon to be an attribute of the group of phenomena to which it belongs, and the group its subject.¹ As well pretend that a single midge of a swarm of midges is an attribute of the swarm, the swarm a subject of that attribute.

M. Renouvier holds to free agency, responsibility, and (all honour to him for the tenet) to duty. But, is it competent to a mere group of consciousnesses to be a free agent? Can a group of discernments, involving or involved with sensations, emotions, questions, remembrances, imaginations, judgments, and nothing that is not a mere modification of consciousness—can such a group, not this or that phenomenon of the group, but the whole acting as a unit, deliberate with intention to prefer one or other of two opposite motives, and

¹ *Revue de Logique Générale*, vol. I. p. 183.

then freely prefer one of them, giving rise in the preference to an intention to act accordingly? As easily suppose that a dust whirl might be capable of such an act, might be subject of the power presupposed by such an act. An act, it seems to me, is something more than a mere object, and is not possible to an entity which is nothing more than mere object. It is essential to a pain to be an object; but that it involves something more than mere objectivity is manifest when we contrast it with the remembrance of a pain. In that contrast the symbol of the pain appears to be a mere object, and the pain to be something more than object. The like is true of all sensations and emotions contrasted with mental symbols of them objective to memory. The difference between mere objectivity and reality is put in sharp relief by the contrast. Although it is essential to a volition to be an object it is also essential to it to be a reality—something more than a phenomenon, something more than the universe of M. Renouvier has room for. But, to little purpose should we grant to M. Renouvier that his personal groups are capable of volition; for he implies that volition is ineffectual as regards persons other than the agent—ineffectual as being related to no involuntary power capable of executing its behest in other persons; other persons could neither be benefited nor injured by that behest. Voluntary power is limited to the generation of an intention; whether event beyond the sphere of the intention and conformable to it shall obtain it is not within the sphere of voluntary power to determine. The apparent bodily movements without one or other of which an intention is, as regards persons other than the voluntary agent, abortive, depend, if on power at all, on involuntary power; for we sometimes vainly intend such movements, and, in an inference from the failure of our intention, discover that we are paralyzed. Such facts are conclusive evidence to common sense that certain involuntary powers are commonly subservient to intention, and make it effectual; but this explanation Phenomenism excludes by its negation of the existence of involuntary power—instructing Will that its impotence exempts it from obligation, that the ideas of responsibility and duty are delusive.

Affection to the principle of parsimony no more exempts Phenomenism than it exempts natural theory from the dualism of immediate and remote objectivity, persons according to Phenomenism being known to each other by means of mental symbols, in respect of which they are remote objects. Though obliged to admit that a great part of the real is knowable only by means of unreal objects, of mere mental symbols, Phenomenism breaks the explanatory connection between symbol and thing symbolized, constituted by the ideas of substance and power, and insists that the infinitude of agreements between both are inexplicable or, what is the same thing, obtain by virtue of impotent necessity. I apperceive myself as con-

versing with John, at the same time John apperceives himself conversing with me, and several observers respectively apperceive themselves as perceiving John and me in conversation. Between these concurrent apperceptions and perceptions there is no explanatory link whatever, except, indeed, impotent necessity be reckoned such a link; and if it be, possibility has ample room for the unvariable turning up of aces by unloaded dice. No prodigies of concurrence are too much for the impotent necessity of M. Renouvier.

Phenomenism fails to tell us whence come phenomena and whither they go. Are they eternal elements, like the pieces of mind-stuff of Professor Clifford, or do they begin and perish? Does phenomenism reject the putative axiom, *ex nihilo nihil fit*?

Consider the reasons of scepticism which our discussion has brought to the surface. How a mere impotence of the mind confers upon a false thesis the air of being an axiom, as in the case of the false thesis, "a thing is either in itself or in something else," on which privation of the idea of time confers the air of being an axiom. How the cast of mental structure which generates the ideas of time and space involve conditions, if not of antinomial contradiction, at least, of perplexity—of such perplexity that to the question, "what is time?" one answers, "If you don't ask me, I know." How it has taken us thousands of years to refute the paralogism of Zeno. How it is confessed on all sides that we have no criterion of truth. Shall we therefore despair of the knowing faculty? Surely not. It has behaved badly enough to discredit dogmatism, but on the whole well enough to be reckoned a *pus aller*. It affords knowledge of our environment sufficiently apt to keep us afloat during a lifetime, and prevision enough to justify some pretension to be true. It has enabled an evolution from savagery to civilization. Would it not be wise to take it for the very fallible but fairly reliable thing that experience has shown it to be, and, above all, to abstain from attempts to improve it by mutilation. We have seen the result of such surgery as M. Renouvier has thought proper to apply to it. He has lopped off the faculties that impose belief in time and space, substance and attribute, cause and effect, and with them, as we have seen, a condition *sine quâ non* of explanation. Seemings of antinomial inconsistency have been throwing philosophy into convulsion, now into Pyrrhonism, now into havoc-making Phenomenism, and every such seeming has, so far as I know, proved to be delusive. If I be wrong, and if any still pretend to discredit the principle of contradiction, would it not be a wise exercise of what *L'Alternative* calls the *arbitrium* to say to it, "I'll not budge for you: you are in all probability a speciousity due to an oversight; at any moment a pin-prick may burst you." What though force, considered in respect of its immediate effect, seems to lose its *differentia* and resolve into a mere inert antecedent: what though limits of times and spaces do not interrupt the

continuity of time and space, and no two of them can be next one another: what though times, spaces, and solid extensions be compounds without elements, refuting the putative axiom that the compound supposes the simple: that the thing we call knowledge is stigmatized by such perplexities, is no reason for denying that it is a *pis aller*. We have tried to improve our poor knowing faculty by depriving it of some of its members, and the result has been the substitution of downright contradiction for mere perplexity. Have we, under the circumstances, any better recourse than to patient scepticism animated by faith and hope?

EDMOND R. CLAY.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

THE problem of the origin of the world¹ is a will-o'-the-wisp which has moved through past ages, and still engages the interest of the scientific as well as the simple. But it is so bound up, on the one hand, with the prevalent interpretation of Biblical history, and on the other with the phenomena of astronomy, geology, and chemistry, that again and again attempts are made to harmonize the changing attitudes of the religious interpreter and the scientific investigator. These attempts are little more than affirmations that science is inspired so long as it declares the divinity of its origin, and that its teaching is discredited when with more modesty or greater faith it declines to regard its conclusions as final, or capable of being yoked with unchanging religious views. M. Faye is imbued with the religious sentiment, and anxious to show that the Biblical teaching, as he understands it, is substantially the same as the theoretical conclusions to which the results of science converge. Having arrived at the conviction that the cosmogony of Laplace is inconsistent with the present state of science and with recent astronomical discoveries, it has occurred to him to discuss the principal ancient and modern cosmogonies. A short introduction touches on the relation of the idea of God to science, and then the work is divided into four parts, which treat of different orders of cosmogony. First, there is a discussion of the teaching of Moses and Genesis; then, in the second part, the ideas of the Greek and Roman philosophers and poets are stated. The third part gives chapters to the teaching of Descartes, Newton, Kant, and Laplace; while the fourth part is devoted to ideas of cosmogony current in the nineteenth century, or, in other words, to conceptions which are acceptable to the author. A large amount of interesting information is mixed up with hypotheses which do not entirely harmonize with the more recent views which Professor Norman Lockyer formulated in his *Bakerian* lecture to the Royal Society. Nor does it appear to us that the supposed harmony of the author's views with the geological history of the earth, is any more philosophical or better supported by fact. It needs a critical knowledge of the distribution of plants and animals to form any conception of the distribution of life and its nature in the primary period; and we are disposed to take exception to all the physical conditions which the author postulates for that period as unsupported by fact; and his statement that animal and vegetable life was uniformly developed all over the

¹ "Sur l'Origine du Monde. Théories Cosmogoniques des Anciens et des Modernes." Par H. Faye, de l'Institut. Seconde Edition, Revue et Augmentée. Paris: Gauthin-Villars. 1886.

earth, would not be acceptable to those who are aware how life varies with every successive division even of the older geological deposits, as well as with the occurrence of the stratum in other localities. A concluding chapter, on life in the universe, examines speculations as to the possible existence of life in other worlds. The work is clearly written, and illustrated with figures of nebulae and some other astronomical phenomena. Religious bodies, whose members are not familiar with science, may be grateful for it; but many scientific readers would have preferred a history of cosmogonies into which religious interpretations had not been introduced.

By higher arithmetic,² Mr. Goyen understands fractions, decimals, equations, proportion, percentages, calculations of profit and loss, and matters which involve square root, cube root, surds, and the mensuration of plane surfaces and of solids. Its object is to cause the student to observe and think for himself, and therefore there is an absence of rules, and of statements which appeal to the memory. His method is first to explain the nature of the processes discussed in the several chapters, and then to illustrate them by worked-out examples, selected with a view of illustrating difficulties. Other examples follow for the use of the student, and the answers to them are given at the end of the book. The work is especially intended for students working without a master, pupil-teachers, and senior pupils in schools; and the author expresses his opinion that no one who masters its methods need have any misgiving as to his ability to satisfy the demands of the most exacting examiner. The method appears to be excellent, and the matter well selected; but in mensuration the treatment is needlessly brief, and in view of its practical importance in so many industries might have been extended with advantage.

A pamphlet on "*Electricity versus Gas*"³ sets forth the defects of gas for illumination and the advantages of electric light, gives some account of lamps, and the relative cost of gas and electricity, explains terms used in measuring electric energy, and briefly notices some applications of electricity as a motor force. It is professedly written for the benefit of those who are prejudiced against electric light from ignorance of the conditions of its use.

Dr. Aveling's Chemistry comprises so much of the science as is required for the matriculation examination of the University of London.⁴ There are preliminary chapters, termed the meaning of chemistry, heat in relation to chemistry, gases, chemical compounds, and valency. The remainder of the book treats of oxygen, the atmosphere, hydrogen, water, carbon, a few carbon compounds, nitrogen, its oxides and acids, fluorine, chlorine, bromine, iodine, sulphur and its compounds, phosphorus, silicon, and boron. The subject is, for the most part, very clearly arranged and stated. Every section comprises exercises, some of which are fully worked out, and at the end answers to the exercises are given. Examination questions follow, and comprise papers from the London University

² "A Higher Arithmetic and Elementary Mensuration, for the Senior Classes of Schools and Candidates preparing for Public Examinations" By P. Goyen, Inspector of Schools, New Zealand. London. Macmillan & Co. 1888.

³ "*Electricity versus Gas*." By John Stent. London. Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1888.

⁴ "*Mechanics and Experimental Science, as required for the Matriculation Examination of the University of London*." By Edward Aveling, D.Sc. Chemistry. With numerous woodcuts. London: Chapman & Hall. 1888.

Calendar, Cambridge examinations for women, and from the King's College Calendar. There is a full index. The work appears to be well suited for the students for whom it is intended.

Professor Wagner, of Darmstadt, has experimented on the influence of nitrogenous manure on the produce of the soil.³ He states that to grow normal crops—peas, vetches, lupins, clover, lucerne—require two or three times more nitrogen than oats, barley, rye, wheat, turnips, potatoes, maize, rape; but that the extra crops they yield when manured with nitrogenous salts are hardly worth mentioning. On the other hand, the produce of barley, rye, oats, wheat, buckwheat, carrots, potatoes, turnips, flax, rape, grass, and spurry is exactly proportional to the increase of the manure. If the yield of barley without manure is taken at 100, with 18 lbs. of nitrogen to the acre it is 167; with 31½ lbs. of nitrogen to the acre it is 220; and with 45 lbs. of nitrogen to the acre, 272. But although there is a slight increase in the yield of leguminous plants with manure, it is so small as to be hardly worth mentioning, the reason being that peas, vetches and clover, lucerne, &c., obtain their nitrogen from the air; while the cereals, root crops, tobacco, flax, &c., obtain their nitrogen from the soil. But if peas or vetches be grown in sand, then a little nitrate of soda will start them as strong plants, till they are able to take nitrogen in the normal way. The author calculates the effect produced by nitrate of soda as a manure on the basis of the weight of nitrogen contained in the plants grown; and since 68 lbs of nitrogen are contained in 2400 lbs. of oats and 4000 lbs. of oat straw, it follows that manuring with 100 lbs. of nitrate of soda would increase the crops by 355 lbs. of oats and 585 lbs. of straw. Tables are given showing the increase of different crops with this manure, and from the value of the produce the result appears to be most satisfactory with poppy seed, beet-root, corn, and cattle turnips; but the author observes that just as we cannot make any gunpowder with 1 lb. of sulphur without 1 lb. of charcoal and 6 lbs. of nitre, so unless the constituents of plant food are mixed in the right proportions, we shall not obtain the maximum yield from the soil. And that, while a crop of oats of 11,500 lbs. can be obtained from 80 lbs. of nitrogen, 100 lbs. of potash, and 50 lbs. of phosphoric acid, so it follows that the crop will only be half this quantity if only 50 lbs. of potash or 25 lbs. of phosphoric acid are present in the soil. The phosphoric acid appears to be indispensable when the plant is young, and without it the nitrate of soda exercises no effect. The author tested the effects of manures by simultaneously growing a number of plants in pots, and these specimens, lettered to indicate the different manures used, are photographed, so as to be shown in comparison with each other. It is considered desirable to put an excess of phosphoric acid and potash into the ground, but to use no more nitrogen than the plants require. This interesting investigation proceeds to give the quantities of manures per acre which should be used for the different kinds of crops, discusses the causes of failure in manuring with nitrate of soda, and examines the question of whether the use of nitrogen leads to exhaustion of the soil. Consideration is also given to the means by which the farmer can best avail himself of the store of nitrogen in the air, with the result that the plants

³ "The Increase in the Produce of the Soil through the rational use of Nitrogenous Manure." By Professor Paul Wagner, Ph.D., Director of the Agricultural Research Station, Darmstadt. Translated by George G. Henderson, M.A., B.Sc. With Photographs of various Experiments in the Cultivation of Plants. London: Whittaker & Co. 1899.

need a sufficient supply of water and sufficient phosphoric acid, potash, and lime. The small size of this pamphlet should bring its scientific matter under the consideration of farmers.

We have received the first two numbers of the "*Annals of Botany*,"⁶ printed and published by the Delegates of the Oxford University Press, and intended to adequately illustrate original memoirs. The parts vary in size and price, and are issued at irregular intervals. The matter consists of memoirs, short notes, notices of books, lists of pamphlets received, and a record of current literature. The work is well printed and illustrated; but although there can be no doubt of the ability of the Clarendon Press to continue such a publication, we doubt whether it would not have been preferable in the interests of science to have issued the work as part of the Transactions of some existing scientific society. It is apparently an attempt to parallel the *Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science*, but we see no reason why the short notes should not have appeared in the "*Annals of Natural History*," and the longer memoirs have been published by the Linnean Society. Anything which augments the usefulness of institutions already in existence seems preferable to the issue of competing publications. The memoirs here brought together are on the fruits and seeds of species of *Bhaumus*, which yield the yellow dye known as rhamnin; on the mucilage-secreting cells of *Blechnum* and *Osmunda*; on the lactiferous tissue in the pith of *Manihot*; on thickenings of the root of *Cycas*. And, in the second number, there are papers on snake-bite antidotes; the absorption of water and its influence on the cell-wall in mosses; on the mode of climbing in the genus *Calamus*; on the life-history of lycopods; and the sieve tubes in *Laminariæ*.

Had the books forming "*The Young Collector Series*"⁷ been planned or directed by a competent editor, greater excellence and usefulness, as well as uniformity, might have characterized the volumes. "*British Reptiles and Batrachians*," by Miss Hopley, only extends to ninety-four pages, but the introduction ends on page 15. It is in no sense an introduction to the subject of the book, but gives a short account of the classifications of animals other than vertebrate, which have been used by Aristotle, Cuvier, and a few later writers. The chapter on Reptiles in general makes no distinction between reptiles and amphibians, and only gives a few meagre general statements, which are not true for all the orders. A chapter is given to the Ophidia, and others to the viper, ring snake, smooth snake, and then forty pages in the middle of the book are devoted to amphibians. The concluding chapters treat of the Saurians. The merit of the volume is in directing attention to British snakes, lizards, frogs, toads, and newts, and in the narration of facts which the writer has observed while keeping the animals in confinement. There is much to be learned by systematic observation of the habits, instincts, and conditions of life, growth, and development of the animals which are here written about, but we could wish the young collector a more systematic introduction to his studies.

The French Government has for some years been publishing the

⁶ "*Annals of Botany*." Vol. I. No. 1 and No. 2. Edited by Isaac Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S.; Sidney Howard Vines, D.Sc., F.R.S.; and William Gilson Farlow, M.D. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press 1887.

⁷ "*The Young Collector Series. British Reptiles and Batrachians*." By Catherine C. Hopley. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1888.

results of the scientific exploration of Tunis.⁸ Each group of animals or plants is described in a separately paged memoir. We have received a study of the spiders by M. Simon, which gives an account of 250 species collected, of which 208 are already known from Algeria; fifteen found in Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean region; seven characteristic of Europe; sixteen only known in Tunis, to which twelve undescribed species are added. Lists are given of localities, and the species are systematically catalogued, and, where necessary, described. The same author gives an account of the terrestrial and fluviatile crustacea, among which are several new species. The beetles are catalogued by M. Lefèvre, and offer no novelties. M. Puton similarly enumerates the Hemiptera, and describes the new forms. An elaborate description of the terrestrial and fluviatile shells is given by Letourneux and Bourguignat, who enumerate 473 species, more or less known previously, and describe 256 new forms, of which 174 are referred to the genus *Helix*. The terrestrial mammals are catalogued by Fernand Lataste, who gives particulars of the line of route of the expedition before describing the various animals which were met with. M. E. Cosson, President of the Mission, republishes, from the "Bulletin de la Société Botanique de France," a note on the flora of the central Kroumir district; first detailing the plants met with day by day, and then giving a systematic list of the species, with their localities, and indications of those which are met with in Tunis for the first time. This memoir is supplemented by the report by M. Letourneux on the botanical mission in the north, south, and west of Tunis, in which the several districts are described systematically; and the vegetation is found to enforce the conclusion that the Mediterranean formerly constituted two basins, owing to the union of Sicily with the African continent in the region of Cape Bon. These publications make an interesting contribution to the natural history of Tunis, but are such as in this country would be published by a scientific society, since they appeal almost exclusively to the scientific naturalist.

The Meteorological Department of the Government of India has commenced the issue of a new series of memoirs on Cyclones,⁹ with the object of placing in the hands of sailors and others particulars of the storms within a few months of their occurrence. The first part describes the Bay of Bengal cyclone, which occurred between the 20th and 28th of May 1887. It is preceded by a few particulars concerning the conditions of the storms, from which it appears that during each south-west monsoon season, between the 15th of June and 15th of September, from six to twelve storms may be expected in the north of the Bay, which will retain sufficient intensity to last for twenty-four hours after reaching land. There is then squally weather at the head of the Bay, and strong westerly or south-westerly gales in the south-east and south of the

⁸ "Exploration Scientifique de la Tunisie." Étude sur les Arachnides, par Eugène Simon; Étude sur les Crustacés, par Eugène Simon; Liste des Coléoptères, par M. Ed. Lefèvre; Énumération des Hémiptères suivie de la description des espèces nouvelles, par M. A. Puton; Prodrôme de la Malacologie terrestre et fluviatile, par MM. A. Letourneux et J. R. Bourguignat; Catalogue Critique des Mammifères Apélagiques Sauvages de la Tunisie, par Fernand Lataste; Note sur la Flore de la Kroumirie Centrale, explorée en 1883 par la Mission Botanique, sous les auspices du Ministère de l'Instruction Publique, par E. Cosson; Rapport sur une Mission Botanique, exécutée en 1884, dans le nord, le sud, et l'ouest de la Tunisie, par A. Letourneux. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1885-1887.

⁹ "Cyclone Memoirs." Part I. Bay of Bengal Cyclone of May 20-28, 1887. Published by the Meteorological Department of the Government of India. Calcutta: Printed by the Superintendent of Government Printing, India. 1888.

storm area. While the average force of the monsoon wind is expressed by the numbers 3 to 5, the force of these winds at sea is frequently expressed by the numbers 8 to 10 or 11. The barometer rarely falls more than $\frac{3}{10}$ of an inch in the storm area, and there is rarely, if ever, a central calm in the storm. Moreover, storms of this character are not accompanied by great storm waves; for as the pressure of the atmosphere is but slightly reduced, the sea-level rises but little in the centre of the cyclone. The more violent and dangerous cyclones are developed in the transition periods between the monsoons, which extend from the beginning of May to the middle of June, and from the middle of September to the beginning of December. In such cyclones there is an outer storm area, where the weather resembles that in the smaller storms which occur during the rains. In the inner storm area the barometer falls rapidly, and this inner area is sharply defined from the outer area and from the central calm. The rainfall in it is excessive, the sea is tremendous, and the winds are of hurricane force. Hence it becomes important for the sailor who enters the outer storm to avoid passing into the inner storm, and the object of these memoirs is primarily to make the nature of the different storms generally known, so that the navigator may have the benefit of previous experience and scientific generalizations. The storm which is here described is an example of the more dangerous cyclones. Its history is traced day by day. The comparatively brief story of the storm is full of interest, and embraces the experience of many ships, and particulars of the effect of the storm wave in the destruction of life and property on land. Six plates show the pressure and direction of the wind from day to day.

Mr. John Eliot contributes to the "Indian Meteorological Memoirs"¹⁰ an enumeration and brief description in tabular form of the south-west monsoon storms of the Bay of Bengal between the years 1882 and 1886. They are fifty-four in number, and are illustrated by charts which give the courses of the storms from day to day, showing their extension over the sea and their prolongation over the land. From these charts we observe that the majority of the storms in July pass in a north-west direction south of the Ganges, sometimes almost crossing India, and that they have not the tendency to curve northward which is seen in most of the storms which occur during June, and that their position is south of the courses of the cyclones of that month and August. Another striking feature shown in the charts is the changed direction of the cyclones during October, November, and December. In October and November many storms extend north-east, more or less parallel to the coast of India towards the head of the Bay striking Aracan; and at the same time another set of storms crosses the Carnatic and Mysore. Mr. Eliot has also written a detailed history of the cyclones of November and December 1886 in the Bay of Bengal. As the south-west monsoon retired from the north of India in October 1886, three cyclones were developed in the neighbourhood of the Andaman Islands at intervals of about a fortnight, and two of them reached the coast in the neighbour-

¹⁰ "Indian Meteorological Memoirs: being Occasional Discussions and Compilations of Meteorological Data relating to India and the Neighbouring Countries." Published by Order of his Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, under the Direction of Henry F. Blanford, F.R.S. Vol. IV.—Part vi. List and Brief Account of the South-West Monsoon Storms generated in the Bay of Bengal during the years 1882 to 1886. IV.—vii.—The Cyclonic Storms of November and December 1886, in the Bay of Bengal. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, India. 1887.

hood of Madras. The first crossed the peninsula into the Arabian Sea. Detailed charts showing the barometric pressure from day to day illustrate the memoir.

Mr. W. L. Dallas¹¹ discusses the winds of the Arabian Sea and North Indian Ocean in an essay which is uniform with the "Indian Meteorological Memoirs," but is issued on the author's responsibility. The author states that when the countries of Southern Asia have a relatively short day, the air of the cooler part of the continent moves at first in a north, and then in a north-east direction for several months; but when the sun passes northward and the continent becomes hotter, an area of maximum temperature is established over Northern India and adjacent countries to which the air over the Indian region moves. The south-east trade winds are at the same time moving northward. They pass the equator in the month of June, and suddenly the circulation of the southern hemisphere joins that of the northern hemisphere, producing the monsoon. Then the rain brought by the wind causes a fall in temperature, though the heat liberated by the condensation prolongs the indraught current, so that the force of the monsoon declines in August, and more markedly in September. The subject is considered under the heads—atmospheric pressure, winds and their force, monsoons and storms. The pressure exhibits its extremes in January and July. When it is high over Beluchistan and Afghanistan, it is low over the equatorial regions. But with February the pressure begins to be less over the land, and commences its progress southward across the ocean. Similarly, in July, the lowest pressure is over the land north of the Arabian Sea, and the readings of the barometer increase to the equator. The discussion of the winds shows one complete annual oscillation in the Indian region. For five months from the end of the spring it is south-west to south, and for five months from the end of the autumn it is north-east to east. The north-east monsoon extends considerably beyond the theoretical limit of the north-east trade winds. The memoir is illustrated by ten plates and numerous tables, which give the results of a multitude of observations. There is some novelty in the views put forward by the author, and they appear to be based on a wider consideration of facts than has previously been available. How far they may be harmonized with the conclusions of the "Indian Meteorological Memoirs" it may be premature to consider, but they are stated boldly and deserve consideration.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

THE object of the latest product¹ of M. de Molinari's able and prolific pen is to demonstrate, in the first place, that the principle of the moral law is to be found in the permanent and general interest of the human

¹¹ "Memoir on the Winds and Monsoons of the Arabian Sea and North Indian Ocean." By W. L. Dallas, formerly of the Meteorological Office, London. Calcutta: Printed by the Superintendent of Government Printing, India. 1887.

¹ "La Morale Economique." Par G. de Molinari. Paris: Librairie Guillaumin et Cie. 1888.

species; in the second place, that this law undergoes modifications according to the conditions of existence of societies; and, finally, that the crisis from which the civilized world suffers at present arises from the fact that the moral law is not yet adapted, in its diverse applications, to the new state which the progress of industry is in process of creating, by unifying and "solidarizing" the interests of the human family. Each society is under the necessity of imposing on its members the rules best fitted to serve its own general and permanent interests. The relations of one society with other societies are governed by the law of competition. The stronger and more capable are constantly eliminating the feebler and less capable, and this elimination is conformable to the general and permanent interest of the species. From which we may conclude that each society, in establishing the rule best fitted to preserve and develop itself, acts not only in its own interest, but also in that of the whole species. This rule of human activity is the moral law. But the moral law is not fixed and immutable in its applications. It is subordinate to the economic conditions of the existence of societies, and these conditions change with the progress of human industry. In consequence of this change, conduct, which was formerly useful to society and the species (consequently moral), may become harmful (consequently immoral). Thus, for example, amongst primitive mankind, what we now should call robbery and murder, were moral, because necessary to the existence of those who could best carry on the struggle for existence against other animals. But as soon as men were organized into societies, this method of getting rid of the unfit members of a society was found to be hurtful to that society, and so it became immoral. But it still continued to be beneficial to the human species that societies should struggle one against another, so that the weakest societies might thereby be eliminated. Consequently war between societies was moral. At the present time, however, societies have reached a stage in which commerce has created so many common interests, that one society cannot suffer without causing suffering to all others. All civilized societies now form, in fact, one economic state, in which the elimination of the feeble and unfit, beneficial to the species, is accomplished, not by war, but by industrial competition, and war has become hurtful to the species, consequently immoral. This is a general outline of the theory of society which M. de Molinari develops in great detail in the seven "Books" which constitute his "*Morale Economique*." An analysis of the contents of each book would take us too long; we must be content with recording their titles, which are as follows:—I. *La Morale dans ses Rapports avec l'Economie Politique*; II. *La Matière de la Morale—Le Droit*; III. *La Matière de la Morale—Le Devoir*; IV. *L'Application de la Morale*; V. *La Genèse de la Morale*; VI. *La Crise Actuelle*; VII. *L'ordre Nouveau*. The "New Order" is the economic state—a kind of informal industrial confederation of all the civilized states of the world, arising out of the cosmopolitan character of modern industry, and the "actual crisis" arises from the incomplete adaptation of the moral law to this new order. This important work exhibits all the author's well-known qualities of style and great range of thought and reading.

The most complete, and, on the whole, most important history of the political side of English national finance during the present century is undoubtedly Mr. Sydney Buxton's "*Finance and Politics*," an exhaus-

* *Finance and Politics: an Historical Study—1788–1885.* By Sydney Buxton, M.P. Two vols. London: John Murray. 1888.

tive "study" in two large vols. Few, if any, readers will go through it systematically from cover to cover; but, as a book of reference, it will be an immense boon to all who have occasion to look into the subject with which it deals. It is accurate, painstaking, and judicious, and as free from party bias as any history dealing with events that have not yet worked out their full effects, and principles still hotly disputed, can be reasonably expected to be. It is a good deal more than a dry record of financial measures, and an epitome of discussions thereon. It is really, in effect, a *résumé* of the national advance in almost every department of material progress during the century. Indeed, it is more than even that. It contains a good deal that might well be omitted as being irrelevant, or at least too remotely relevant. For instance, the American Civil War is dragged in in a way for which we see no adequate reason. No doubt this, like all great political or social upheavals, at home or abroad, disturbed our trade and commerce and finance; it did so to an exceptional degree. But the historian of English finance might well content himself with noting the disturbance, pointing to the cause, and showing how the cause operated, without wandering off into a history of the cause and of the causes of the cause. We take no objection to the voluminous footnotes which Mr. Buxton apologizes for. They are generally illustrative of the text, and interesting in themselves, and if any one objects to them he can, as the author very fairly says, skip them. One great lesson that is impressed on us by a perusal of Mr. Buxton's work is that the influence of general political and social events on the financial prosperity of a country is very close indeed. No one, of course, doubts this who gives a moment's thought to it; but it is often overlooked. Another general lesson well illustrated by Mr. Buxton is the converse of this—namely, that sound financial methods have a great deal to say to the prosperity of the nation and the happiness of private individuals. We congratulate Mr. Buxton on the completion of what must have been an arduous task, involving immense labour and depending so largely for its success on sound judgment.

Mr. W. L. Jordan's "Standard of Value"² has reached a fifth edition. Four long "prefaces"—one for each edition except the fourth—are included in the present issue. They are really long discussions on the objections and arguments of opponents of bimetalism. The six original papers are thus supplemented by an almost equal mass of matter, of at least equal value as a contribution to the controversy.

The charm of his pure, strong, literary style, as well as the earnestness of his convictions, make Mr. William Morris attractive, even while we are fully conscious that he is carried away by the vehemence of his passionate hatred of the existing social and industrial *régime*. This is particularly true of "Signs of Change,"⁴ a well-got-up little volume of seven pieces, "all of them simply Socialist lectures written for *viva voce* delivery," and intended to put before the reader some sides of Socialism "from the point of view of a man who is neither a professional political economist nor a professional politician." How Mr. Morris—admirer, poet, artist, and prosperous capitalist manufacturer—came to be the uncompromising foe he is of the art, the capitalism, the whole social system, which, to all appearance, formed for him a most comfortable environ-

² "The Standard of Value." By William Leighton Jordan. Fifth Edition. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1888.

⁴ "Signs of Change: Six Lectures delivered on Various Occasions." By William Morris, Author of "The Earthly Paradise." London: Reeves & Turner. 188

ment, is a question of considerable psychological interest. Mr. Morris gives us a brief account of his revolt. In the preface of the little volume under notice he tells us that his ordinary work forced on his attention the contrast between times past and the present day, making him look with grief and pain on things which many men notice but little, if at all. The repulsion to pessimism, which is, he thinks, natural to a man busily engaged in the arts, compelled him once to hope that the ugly disgraces of civilization might be got rid of by the conscious will of intelligent persons; yet, as he strove to stir up people to this reform, he found that the causes of the vulgarities of civilization lay deeper than he had thought, and little by little he was driven to the conclusion that all these uglinesses are but the outward expression of the innate moral baseness into which we are forced by our present form of society, and that it is futile to attempt to deal with them from the outside. Whatever he has written, or spoken on the platform, on these social subjects, is the result of the truths of Socialism meeting his earlier impulse, and giving it a definite and much more serious aim. No one who reads "Signs of Change" will doubt the seriousness of its author, nor the definiteness of his aim, so far as definiteness is at all attainable in a scheme of social revolution so vast, so all pervading; so opposed to the interests—or shall we call them prejudices?—of the most powerful section of society. At all events, Mr. Morris makes it perfectly clear that he will be satisfied with nothing less than a complete change in the form of society. No tinkering of the present form with land-nationalization, cumulative income-tax, new factory laws, and such like will serve. They are at best hopeful signs; but "those who think that they can deal with our present system in this piecemeal way very much underrate the strength of the tremendous organization under which we live." He warns the semi-Socialist Democrats that they will be made the cat's-paw of some of the wiliest of the Whigs. Several of their measures, such as allotment schemes, schemes tending to peasant-proprietorship, co-operation, and the like, in spite of their benevolent appearance, are, after all, really "weapons in the hands of reactionaries having for their real object the creation of a new middle-class made out of the working-class and at their expense; the raising, in short, of a new army against the attack of the disinherited." He specially objects to peasant-proprietorship, and it is instructive to note on what grounds. It is, in his view, "a mere piece of reaction, flying right in the face of the commercial development of the day, which tends ever more and more towards the aggregation of capital, thereby smoothing the way for the organized possession of the means of production by the workers when the true revolution shall come." These few quotations serve to illustrate Mr. Morris's attitude towards parliamentary reforms of even the most advanced Radical character. Indeed, in the preface to Mr. Fairman's "Principles of Socialism made Plain," Mr. Morris is still more explicit. After giving reasons for his profound distrust of Parliament, he states that his own hope "lies in converting the associated workmen to Socialism, and in their organizing a great inclusive body, which would feel itself consciously at strife with the proprietary class, and its organ—Parliament."

Turning away from the methods by which he contemplates the attainment of the Socialist revolution, we must admit that Mr. Morris is a propagandist of formidable influence. No one knows better than he how to rouse the noblest sympathies of humanity, the highest aspirations

of art and morality, and yoke them to the chariot of Socialism. He makes no attempt to deal with the objections of opponents. He brushes them aside with the scornful impatience of the preacher of a new gospel. His lofty tone appeals more to our imagination and our sympathies than to our understandings. For a simple statement and explanation of Socialist doctrines, and a reply to the most obvious objections, the reader can hardly find a handier little book than the one referred to above.⁵

"Chants of Labour"⁶ is another evidence of the activity of the Socialist propaganda. It is a collection of songs (with music) "for the use of the people, and mainly the product of the people," though we also find in the list of authors the names of Burns, Shelley, Kingsley, Walt Whitman, and Mr. William Morris himself.

Mr. Dawson's "German Socialism"⁷ will be found a fairly satisfactory performance of the promise of its title-page. The author traces with considerable minuteness the Socialist movement in Germany from the beginning of the century to the present time. Lassalle, his life and work, are very fully treated. Next to him, Rodbertus and Marx receive the largest share of the author's attention. The work is historical rather than critical. For some reason or other it fails to interest the reader. And surely Mr. Dawson is in error in ascribing Socialism to political rather than economic causes. The whole aim of Socialism is to change economic conditions. This, of course, cannot be accomplished without setting political forces in action, either those of the enemies of economic change or those of its friends. But for political movements, apart from their bearing upon economic questions, Socialism cares nothing.

The author of "The New Social Order"⁸ says little about Socialism, yet we can hardly be wrong in classing him amongst Christian Socialists, if we take the general spirit of his book as our text. He undertakes to present "a brief and popular account of some of the changes wrought in personal character and in social life by the spirit of Jesus Christ." Mr. Fordyce stands on firm ground when he points to the influence of Christian ethics on personal character through its exaltation of the milder virtues—love, temperance, patience, purity, &c.—compared with the heroic virtues of antiquity—courage and patriotism, for instance. Here he works on solid historical foundations, and the result is a series of interesting and instructive pictures of ancient ideals and practices which the Christian spirit came into conflict with, and eventually discredited, if it did not utterly overthrow them. But when he attempts to deal with societies he is not so happy, and his apologies for the little success of Christianity in that direction show that he is conscious of his failure. No analysis of the causes of the improvement, such as it is, in modern social and international life can be satisfactory which wholly ignores the effect of the flood of light and truth that modern research has let in from every side on almost every subject in which men are interested. For

⁵ "The Principles of Socialism made Plain; and Objections, Methods, and Quack Remedies Considered." By Frank Fairman. With Preface by William Morris. London: W. Reeves. 1888.

⁶ "Chants of Labour: a Song-Book of the People. With Music." Edited by Edward Carpenter. With two Designs by Walter Crane. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1888.

⁷ "German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle: a Biographical History of German Socialistic Movements during this Century." By William Harbutt Dawson. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1888.

⁸ "The New Social Order." By John Fordyce, M.A. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1888.

eighteen centuries the spirit of Christianity has struggled to win the individual. It has done great things in this struggle. —But in the larger field of social relations it has interfered but little, and with marvellously small effect. Indeed, it is only in the present century that it can point to any triumphs; and it is significant that it begins to win victories only when knowledge throws its beams across the field of battle. Granting that Christian ethics are a perfect guide as far as individual conduct only is concerned, Mr. Fordyce has yet to show that they are sufficient for the guidance of societies as well as individuals.

"*Arabia Deserta*,"⁹ one can see at a glance, almost, is an important work, perhaps a very important. Its author, Mr. Charles M. Doughty, is rarely skilled in learning of a rare sort—Arabia and Arabians, ancient and modern. He has lived much among the wild tribes of the desert, studied their language, literature, customs, beliefs, has visited and carefully explored almost every spot of the desert that possesses historic interest, and pondered wearily over the problems that such a life and such scenes must suggest. The narrative of his intercourse with the wild dwellers in these seldom-visited regions is so minute, Mr. Doughty's mind is so thoroughly saturated with Arab thought and speech and habit, that we may safely say no Englishman has given us such an insight into these as Mr. Doughty has done. But for some reason, which we cannot explain, he writes in a style and tongue peculiar to himself—a picturesque quasi-scriptural style—which has its charm indeed when one is accustomed to it, but which, coupled with a very free use of Arabic words, somewhat enhances the general reader's difficulty in following the curious narrative of exploration and adventure which fills these two large volumes. Indeed, were it not for the excellent index and glossary of Arabic words, the text would often be quite unintelligible. Truly, as its author warns us, "The book is not milk for babies: it might be likened to a mirror, wherein is set forth faithfully some parcel of the soil of Arabia, smelling of saun and camels." Mr. Doughty's task was partly geological, partly archæological. The precise value of the results obtained in these fields cannot be well judged from the present volumes, although the author has prepared a sketch map itinerarium of part of North-Western Arabia, coloured so as to show the geological constitution of the peninsula, and has also appended a short notice on the subject. The first volume is "adorned by M. Renan's translation of the (Aramaic) epitaphs of Medâin Sâleh or el-Héjr," and at the end of the same volume will be found the Marquis de Vogüé's "precious note of the hewn architecture of those monuments."

Mr. Banbury's *Sierra Leone*¹⁰ is a very readable book, descriptive of "an Englishman's life in the most interesting and deadly colony" of that name. The origin of the settlement and its early history are certainly interesting as philanthropic experiments. Otherwise there is little to attract us in either the land or the people. It was founded just a century ago by the "Committee for the Relief of the Black Poor," formed to look after the slaves in England who suddenly found themselves free men, in consequence of Lord Mansfield's famous decision in 1772—free, but without a shred of property, unsuited to the conditions of life in this country, and unable to return to the colonies whence they

⁹ "*Travels in Arabia Deserta*." By Charles M. Doughty. Two vols. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1888.

¹⁰ "*Sierra Leone; or, The White Man's Grave*." By G. A. Lethbridge Banbury. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1888.

came, slavery being still legal there. By way of escaping from this dilemma, several hundreds were sent out to form a colony for themselves at Sierra Leone. Many of them died of fever within a few months, but the settlement, though never really prosperous, managed to live on, and, as an asylum for the unfortunates rescued in more recent times from Arab slavers, it has played a part in a work of pure humanity such as few colonies can boast. We had hoped that Mr. Banbury would be able to tell us that science and experience had at last found the talisman which would enable white men to laugh at African malaria. Unfortunately there is no such thing known. The dangers can be mitigated, but no one, old or young, strong or weak, can feel himself secure for twenty-four hours. Nor is fever the only curse of Sierra Leone. Alligators are bad, but the "jigger" is worse. It is a little insect which burrows unseen under the toe or finger nails, builds itself a nest the size of a pea, and fills it with 10,000 eggs, which, if allowed to hatch out, disperse themselves through the body and may cause death. The only safety is in cutting out the nest as soon as its presence is detected, as, fortunately, it generally is before the eggs are hatched. For all these afflictions there are, however, compensations, and a man can be happy even in Sierra Leone.

The new and cheaper edition of Mr. Ayrton's "Child-Life in Japan"¹¹ deserves a welcome. There is no better way of understanding the domestic life of a civilized people than to study their child-life. Nothing can help us to know them as men more than observing them as children. The relations of parents to their children display most effectively the warmth and depth of the affections. The more we observe the Japanese in these aspects the more we admire them, and envy their children—brown half-naked urchins, scrambling about so happily, with nothing to be miserable about, "in a land where a child is scarcely ever slapped, where thin clothing, always loose, is yet warm in winter, where it basks freely in air and sunshine, and lives in a house that . . . is the very beau ideal of an infants' playground." Intelligent English children will find great pleasure in reading about the doings of these far off little islanders, whose toys are in every English nursery. Some of the translated tales are very pretty as well as correct in sentiment. The illustrations, by Japanese artists, are a striking feature of the book, and give it local colour.

The settlement of the case of *Dadaji v. Rukhmabai*, in which the Bombay Court of Appeal has refused to sanction a decree of the Court of first instance—which ordered a Hindu virgin-wife, married in infancy, to surrender herself to her adult husband, for whom she had an invincible repugnance—carries forward another stage the Indian reformers' protest against the hitherto inexorable custom of infant marriage. This incident may serve to recall attention to the work named below,¹² by Mr. B. M. Malabari, the Parsee writer and journalist, whose crusade on behalf of "the child-martyrs" of India, coming just at the turn of the tide of native opinion, has had remarkable effect in formulating and concentrating that opinion against the abuses inseparable from the irrevocable marriage of infants, and in favour of widow re-marriage. In this little volume,

¹¹ "Child-Life in Japan; and Japanese Child-Stories." By M. Chaplin Ayrton. London: Griffith, Farran, Oken & Welsh. 1888.

¹² "Gujarāt and the Gujarātis: Pictures of Men and Manners taken from Life." By Behramji M. Malabari (Author of "The Indian Muse in English Garb.") London: W. H. Allen & Co. Bombay: Education Society's Press.

which is largely autobiographical, we trace the germinating and earlier efforts of the writer, which, when matured, enabled him to rouse large numbers of his Hindu fellow-countrymen to tolerate and support, if not adopt, the great social reform in question. In it he describes the people, castes, and customs of his native province, of which Surat is the ancient capital and Broach the birthplace of the author. As might be expected in a then unpractised writer in an alien tongue, his manner is often quaint, and his expressions sometimes more racy than refined; but, as he says, in his chapter on "The Thralldom of Caste," "it is my business to place before the reader the real pictures of life and manners, rough, crude, sometimes half-naked, but always natural." It is, indeed, this realism and unreserve, combined occasionally with a reckless humour, that gives special value to these social sketches in the most populous province of Western India—which on its commercial side is intimately connected with the great trading emporium of Bombay. There are many passages of greater literary value, as, for instance, in the chapter on "The Inimitable Ramayan," the finer influences of which are traceable even amidst the coarser customs that have grown up amongst the people since the degenerate era of Puranic times. It is to these that the late Mr. E. B. Eastwick, who supplied a kindly and appreciative preface to the book, thus refers:—

"Among the more general and lighter descriptions, there are many sketches that will be new to English readers, as, for instance, the manner in which the people of India enjoy their holidays, or the elephant-fights in the arena at Baroda. Many of these more interesting passages have drifted into the later chapters, and might be overlooked unless pointed out by reviewers."

The earlier portion of the book contains some amusing accounts of the writer's earlier journalistic experience, and lively descriptions of Surat and its people; also some interesting reminiscences of his teachers and the public men of the province. Amongst these he gratefully refers to the older class of missionaries, who, by their intimate knowledge of the vernacular, and their simple, kindly ways, had earned the respect of all classes. Thus this unpretending little book has a special value of its own; though the author has long since outgrown the amateurish period to which it belongs. He has since travelled over a large portion of India in advocating the social reform with which his name is associated; and his weekly paper, the *Indian Spectator*, is one of the most favourable specimens of the native Indian press. The discrimination and ability with which Mr. Malabari has treated public questions in his journal secured for him the kindly regard of the last Viceroy, and appreciative notice from the present holder of that dignity; though his independence as an exponent of native opinion has never been called in question.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE mere process of acquiring information about the doings of our earliest ancestors is so fascinating that prehistoric archæology has an interest quite apart from the value of the facts discovered. No one will, perhaps, ever know for certain whether skulls were trepanned to let out a demon which caused headache or epilepsy, or, as a rite of initiation, not more dangerous or painful than the Australian wharepin. But, meantime, the examination of skulls thus treated, the consideration whether the operation was performed during life or after death, and the comparison of roundels or annulets formed of pierced pieces of skull, will be zealously continued in the hope that some accidental discovery will supply conclusive evidence, just as the discovery of a vertebra, with a broad-edged flint sticking in it, is a proof that that particular shape was used as an offensive weapon. Another *crux* is the presence of heated stones in paleolithic tombs. Was this a survival of cremation, or an attempt to dry and thus preserve the corpse? The evidence for the discussion of questions of this kind is very fairly presented in a recent volume of the "*Bibliothèque Scientifique Contemporaine*,"¹ and the author is too wise in many cases to commit himself to any definite solution of the mystery.

Dr. Freeman has published a couple of interesting lectures² delivered at Oxford in the Jubilee year, discussing principally the changes in the map of Europe during the fifty years of the Queen's reign, and commenting with some severity on the new use of the word "Europe," in such phrases as "the will of Europe," where it means "simply six Powers—five nations and a family—who have received no commission to act in the name of their fellows, but who speak and act as if they were so commissioned, who expect their will to be obeyed, simply because they have the physical strength to make men obey it." This rule of force, Dr. Freeman thinks, shows some signs of becoming obsolete, and he does not despair of a time coming when nations will be free to act for themselves without the consent "of a narrow oligarchy acting without any commission but its own will." In the same volume are two lectures comparing the Teutonic conquest in Britain with that in Gaul, and restating views which are familiar to all readers of Dr. Freeman's books. A discussion of Mr. Seebohm's and Mr. Coote's views about the continuity of Roman land measurement and landlords would have been most instructive, but the reader must content himself with the remark that "if the invaders found the land neatly and clearly meted out, I know not why they should not have kept the boundaries of an estate, even though they knocked its owner on the head."

"A Dream of John Ball"³ is scarcely perhaps an historical work in the strictest sense, but yet Mr. Morris's wonderful faculty of bringing

"Before men's eyes the image of the thing
His heart is filled with,"

¹ "*L'Archéologie Préhistorique*." Par Le Baron J. de Baye. Paris: J. B. Baillière et Fils. 1898.

² "*Four Oxford Lectures*. 1887." By E. A. Freeman. London: Macmillan & Co. 1887.

³ "*A Dream of John Ball*." By W. Morris. London: Reeves & Turner. 1888.

gives it a distinct historical value. No such picture of the English yeomen and craftsmen who flocked round Wat Tyler and Jack Straw is to be found elsewhere. And, just as is the case in Morris's poetry, the reader sees the scenes described so clearly that he feels that, if an artist, he could paint them as easily as he could copy a picture. The range of the long-bow is perhaps rather exaggerated, when Will Green talks about killing through cloth or leather at 500 yards. Though Robin Hood's father shot "two north country miles and an inch at a shot," that is a tale of one of the "*fortes ante Agamemnona*," and the biggest distances mentioned in the ballads as actually shot over is twenty score paces, that is, 1000 feet, and even that is likely to be beyond the mark. The frontispiece of Adam delving and Eve spinning, by Burne Jones, increases the value of the book, but we wish Mr. Morris had given us a sketch of one of the incidents of the dream—the herald's address to the insurgents, for instance.

Dr. Rankin has published a fourth edition of his "*Handbook of the Church of Scotland*."¹ The work was originally issued in 1879 for the purpose of Church defence, and as an antidote to the literature of the Liberation Society. It is a succinct history of the Church of Scotland from A.D. 400, and surveys the careers of all the Scottish Churches. It is crammed with information, which is written with so much brevity that it resembles a note-book rather than a history. It would be invaluable if it had been properly indexed. Unhappily the slovenly prepared and meagre index is the least satisfactory part of the book. It has been, and will deservedly continue to be, the *vade-mecum* of politicians who attack or defend the Establishment of the Church of Scotland.

The issue of a second edition of Jeans' translation of Cicero's Letters² is a proof of the soundness of the principles upon which his work is based. The translations read like letters, and the style of the translation is as different as the style of the originals. Some were written for a public purpose, and in the present day would have been sent to the *Times*. These are rendered in a dignified, clear style, while the spirit of the familiar letters to Atticus, which are playful and even careless, and not devoid of bad jokes, is reproduced in a manner which argues the highest skill on the part of the translator, for all it looks so easy. The translation of Greek phrases by French ones, and of quotations by quotations, has been very successfully achieved in spite of its difficulty. There are notes explaining the circumstances referred to in the Letters and references to historians for more detailed information.

Mrs. Holmuden is continuing her translations of M. de Pressensé's works,³ and maintains the same high standard of clearness and accuracy, though it is perhaps a needless adherence to the original to retain the word "*Noël*" instead of translating it by "*Christmas*." The great French divine is perhaps the ablest and most learned exponent of the view that all ancient history, all false religions, were designed by the Deity to prepare the way for the reception of the Gospel of Christ, by arousing a desire and need of a revelation and a Saviour, and showing that humanity was unable to work out its own salvation. It is from this

¹ "*Handbook of the Church of Scotland*." By James Rankin, D.D. Fourth Edition. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1888.

² "*The Life and Letters of M. T. Cicero*." By Rev. G. E. Jeans, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1887.

³ "*The Ancient World and Christianity*." By E. de Pressensé, D.D. Translated by A. R. Holmuden. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1888.

point of view that all religions are discussed, from that of primitive man,

"Who worshipped the rain and the breeze,
And bogies and serpents and crows,"

down to the Epicureans and Stoics of the Roman Empire, whose highest flight of morality was a personal rectitude coupled with philosophical indifference to anything external. But the book is well worth reading, even by those who entirely dissent from the author's hypothesis, for the sake of the well-arranged collection of facts which it contains.

Mr. Nagendra Nath Ghose, a member of the English bar, practising in the High Court of Calcutta, complains that educated natives of India have no "bright outlook before them," much the same complaint that is made, in a lower plane, about Board School children, and very strongly advocates the admission of native Indians to the covenanted service. This is not the place to discuss such a suggestion, in which the good of the public and of the public service, not of the officers, should be the chief considerations; but surely the looking to Government to solve the question of want of employment in such a way is not a very hopeful sign. Do not law, medicine, tuition, literature, commerce, afford openings, and are they yet overstocked with natives of India? The career of Kristo Das Pal, in whose biography⁷ the above complaint occurs, is an instance of what can be done by a native, who, though he had opportunities, which, as Mr. Nagendra Nath Ghose says, no one can do without, still he had not everything in his favour. To begin with, he belonged to the low caste called Telce, so that "in spite of his education, in spite of his exalted and influential position, he could not sit down to dinner with members, however insignificant, poor, and debased, of any of the superior castes. Now the Viceroy of India might have no objection to dine with him, but a poor Brahmin or Kayesth, earning eight or ten rupees a month as a cook, sircar, or clerk, could never bring himself down so low as to dine with Hon. Kristo Das Pal, or to marry a member of his family." Besides this, his father was poor; but by doing well at school, and cultivating his remarkable powers of oratory at a debating club in Calcutta, and his literary talents by writing for various papers, he gradually gained more and more influential positions. In 1861, being then about twenty-four years old, he became the editor of the *Hindoo Patriot*, and subsequently secretary to the British Indian Association, municipal commissioner and justice of the peace, member of the Legislative Council of Bengal, Companion of the Order of the Indian Empire, and in 1883 he was elected by the British Indian Association to the Viceregal Council as a representative of the Zemindars. He was one of the two political leaders in Bengal, and was gradually educating his countrymen to take an interest in politics, especially in such points as the development of representative institutions, the gradual substitution of Indian for European official agency, and the extension of education and industry (which last has almost perished in consequence of the importation of European goods), and no doubt there are worthy successors on whom his mantle has fallen. The author of his Life writes with affection and enthusiasm, the effect of which is heightened instead of marred by slight peculiarities in the English.

Another book on India which we have received is a new edition of

⁷ "Kristo Das Pal: a Study." By Nagendra Nath Ghose. Calcutta: Lahiri & Co.

Colonel Malleeson's well known Military History,⁸ which is a standing instance of the advantage of an historian having personal knowledge of his subject. The author is able to show, especially in the cases of the battles of Chilianwala and Gujrat, that the military despatches are entirely untrustworthy, even in matters of fact, which any one writing at a more remote date would probably not have been able to discover.

Two more of the "Twelve English Statesmen" have just appeared. Mr. H. D. Traill's *Life of William III.*⁹ is written with sufficient cleverness, but it is marred by its narrowness of political view, and its strange omission of any reference to the Irish policy of William and his disregard of the Treaty of Limerick. There is a too evident purpose in the book to use William's English career so as to deal roughly with the naughty Whigs, to permit us to say that the cleverness of the book is equalled by its judgment.

Mr. Harrison's sketch of Oliver Cromwell¹⁰ is distinguished by a power of appreciation and sympathy, even for what is not distinctly approved, which is not very common in historical writings. He recognizes, for instance, that the universal and almost exclusive study of the Bible, soon after English versions had become common, had so saturated the people with Biblical ideas, that the feeling of the direct interposition of God in human affairs, and His siding with one party or the other, was perfectly honest and genuine, and the expression of this feeling in Biblical phraseology was a natural speech, and not, as it soon became, a mere affectation, or cant. He has no approval for bloodshed, but can admire the stern sense of duty and thoroughness which caused Cromwell's victories to be accompanied by pitiless slaughter of fugitives and unarmed persons. He can describe with equal candour Cromwell's opposition to tyrannical government and his gradual assumption of a position about as despotic as the rule which he helped in overthrowing, though his power was directed to better objects. One remark, referring especially to his willingness to replace Charles on the throne, is well worth noting, that Cromwell, "like so many great statesmen, was never in the van of the movement, but always just ahead of the central force," a neat way of explaining the mutual attitude of the Protector, and such men as Vane and Ludlow and Hazelrig and Sydney. As Mr. Harrison shows, England owed to Cromwell and his party the substitution of Parliamentary for personal government in England, the replacement of personal loyalty by duty to the State, and a peaceable union with Scotland, balanced by an inheritance of well-deserved hatred from the people of Ireland. Not, of course, that Cromwell was the only or the first English statesman who was to blame in that respect, for the policy of the extermination of "Irish rebels" had begun in the last century, as is amply shown in Dean Church's *Life of Edmund Spenser*,¹¹ which has just been reprinted for the fourth time, having originally appeared in Macmillan's Series of "Men of Letters."

The sketch of Lord Bacon,¹² by the same author, which originally appeared in the same series, has also been republished. The new practice

⁸ "The Decisive Battles of India" By Colonel G. B. Malleeson. New Edition. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1888.

⁹ "William III." By H. D. Traill. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

¹⁰ "Oliver Cromwell." By Frederic Harrison. London: Macmillan & Co. 1898.

¹¹ "Spenser." By R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

¹² "Bacon." By R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

of printing on the fly-leaf the dates of previous editions is greatly to be commended.

Mr. Symonds' translation of Benvenuto Cellini's Autobiography¹³ has already reached a second edition. Combining, as Cellini did, in one person, the artist and the bravo, two "characteristic and typical products of the Italian Renaissance," his Life is not only amusing in the highest degree, but initiates the reader into the conditions of life and thought in the sixteenth century as few other books do. To praise a translation of Mr. Symonds' is needless. The Introduction will tell the reader who is new to the subject all he wants to know about the history of the memoirs, and such matters, besides supplying critical remarks on Cellini's art and character. The explanation of the aureole which the artist saw around his head after his imprisonment and illness in the Castle of S. Angelo, is very curious, and is a proof of the powers of observation both of Cellini and his editor. It was visible in the early morning, not around the head, but the shadow of the head, on dewy grass. It is needless to say that it was not caused by divine favour, as Cellini thought, but by the reflection of the sun's rays from the dewdrops. The same phenomenon was noticed by Thoreau. In his remarks about Cellini's art, Mr. Symonds attempts to account for the coarseness of the limbs and shortness of the stature of the Perseus as being due to the difficulty of casting the whole figure at once, which the artist had decided to do. This may be the case. Perseus certainly looks far more like a gladiator than a hero, but is not this conception thoroughly characteristic of the artist and his time?

One of the best of our English autobiographies, that of Lord Herbert of Cherbury,¹⁴ has just appeared in "The Camelot Classics," a monthly shilling series. It is based upon Mr. Sidney Lee's edition, which was noticed recently in these columns.

Nowhere, surely, has pure learning been of such practical value as among the Polish Jews¹⁵ in the last century.

"Riches, bodily advantages, and talents of every kind have, indeed, in their eyes, a certain worth, and are esteemed in proportion; but nothing stands among them above the dignity of a good Talmudist. He has the first claim upon all offices and positions of honour in the community. . . . He who does not meet such a scholar with sufficient respect is, according to the judgment of the Talmudists, damned to all eternity."

But besides this outward respect and its bearing on public life, the social aspect is still more extraordinary:—

"A wealthy merchant, farmer, or professional man, who has a daughter, does everything in his power to get a good Talmudist for his son-in-law. As far as other matters are concerned, the scholar may be as deformed, diseased, and ignorant as possible; he will still have the advantage over others. The future father-in-law of such a phoenix is obliged, at the betrothal, to pay to the parents of the youth a sum fixed by previous agreement; and, besides the dowry for his daughter, he is further obliged to provide her and her husband with food, clothing, and lodging for six or eight years after their marriage, during which time the interest on the dowry is paid, so that the learned son-in-law may continue his studies at his father-in-law's expense. After this period he receives

¹³ "The Life of Benvenuto Cellini." Translated by J. Addington Symonds. Second Edition. Nimmo. 1888.

¹⁴ "The Autobiography of Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury. Edited by W. H. Dircks. London: Walter Scott. 1888.

¹⁵ "Solomon Maimon: an Autobiography." Translated by J. Clark Murray. Paisley: Gardner. 1888.

the dowry in hand, and then he is either promoted to some learned office, or he spends his whole time in learned leisure. In either case the wife undertakes the management of the household and the conduct of business; and she is content, if only, in return for all her toils, she becomes in some measure a partaker of her husband's fame and future blessedness."

The Talmudist, from whose autobiography this passage is taken, was almost fought for by two parents, and was actually married at eleven years old to the only child of a rich hotel-keeper, the successful competitor. He hoped to gain ascendancy over her for life by treading on her foot during the ceremony—an old superstition; but she was sharp enough to tread on his first, like the Cornish bride who, when her husband hurried off to drink at the well of St. Keyne, was found to have "taken a bottle to church." The young bridegroom had to suffer a great deal also from his mother-in-law, until he frightened her into decent behaviour by appearing at her bedside as his mother's ghost, which was more successful than an attempt to procure invisibility by means of a process laid down in the Cabbalah Maasith. As the youngster's first use of his assumed state was to box a comrade's ears, he hardly deserved to succeed. The condition of the schools where this learning was acquired was most barbarous, as indeed all Poland appears to have been. Among other customs mentioned, it is worth noting that at Prince Radzivil's entertainments, "as every goblet was drained, cannons were fired," a custom that Shakespeare attributed to the Court of Denmark. Maimonides' later life was passed in Berlin, where he gave himself up to study of literature and metaphysics, and became entirely separated from his early associations.

"The Life of Victor Hugo," by Mr. Marzials,¹⁶ is a delightful work. The story of the long and eventful life of the great French writer is told in a charming manner. His opinions and his works are discussed with a clear, healthy mind, in a spirit of manly reverence for all that is good in them. The book is admirable in every respect. It affords to those who have not been able to read Hugo's works in French an excellent view of their contents, and sound judgment concerning what is of the best therein. Whoever begins to read this book will read it to the end with glad avidity.

Some portions of M. G. Ferry's "Life of Balzac"¹⁷ have already appeared in "Le Gil Blas." The work is made up of a number of sketches of the friendships of the author of "La Comédie Humaine" with various women. Some of them are not very interesting, and some are suggestive of a worse than sentimental side to Balzac's character. A sentimental man, his ambition was expressed in very early days in a letter to his sister, wherein he wrote: "Laure, mes deux souls et immenses désirs, être célèbre et être aimé, seront-ils jamais satisfaits?" Yet, born at Tours in 1799, he was unmarried until 1850, on March 14, when he married Countess Hanska, one of his old friends. He died on August 20, 1850. By most people the author of "Contes Drolatiques" is regarded as a humourist merely. M. Ferry has portrayed him as a man mostly sad and frequently despairing. The heroines of his romances are Balzac's portraits of his intimate women friends. Thus, the Duchess de Castries was the model for La Duchesse de Langeais, George Sand appears in "Béatrix" as Camille Maupin, and the affecting character, Mme. de Mor-

¹⁶ "Life of Victor Hugo." By Frank T. Marzials. London: Walter Scott. 1888.

¹⁷ "Balzac et ses Amies." Par Gabriel Ferry. Paris: Calmann Levy. 1888.

sauf, in "Le Lys dans la Vallée" was a portrait of M^{me}. de Berney. Therefore this work, which tells the story of the great romancer's relationships with the heroines of his books, is likely to attract and interest the readers of Balzac's works.

BELLES LETTRES.

THE "City of Dream,"¹ by Robert Buchanan, is by way of being a modern Pilgrim's Progress. A pilgrim in quest of "The City of God" sets forth on his travels, and having, on the recommendation of Evangelist, made trial of Christopolis, a city of exceeding beauty, but full of cruelty and uncleanness, he passes through "The Groves of Faun," "The Vale of Vain Delights," "The Valley of Dead Gods," and other strange places, until he reaches at last "The City made without God." The second city is fairer even than Christopolis, and there is to all appearance neither sorrow nor suffering nor cruelty to be found therein, and here the pilgrim for very joy at the unexpected vision of peace and beauty is fain to rest. But here, too, there are dark secrets, the revelation of which turns the pilgrim's satisfaction into loathing and horror. There is "The Hospital of Birth," where sickly babies, in spite of the low moan of woful mothers, are painlessly dispatched before they can live to taint the race; and there is the marble-wrought temple where the lecturer demonstrates from the brain of the living hound the laws which govern the intellectual life of Man. Horror-stricken, and discerning in the form of the tortured animal "the likeness of the Son of Man," the pilgrim calls aloud upon "Almighty God," and is imprisoned as a madman. At length, after passing through a shadowy land—"a region of monsters and strange births of Time"—he reaches the shore of the Celestial ocean, on the farther side of which, somewhere, somehow, is "God and the radiant City of my Dream!" The allegory, unlike that which lives and breathes in the marvellous original, is thin, unreal, and inapt, while the moral, if moral it can be called, will speak only to those who perceive in dreams the meaning which they miss in the world of substance, who find their full satisfaction only in the contemplation of "the things which are not seen." On the other hand, the "City of Dream" is a fine poem, and contains numerous passages powerfully and beautifully expressed. Of the songs and lyrical pieces perhaps the most striking are "Jesus of Nazareth," "Mary Magdalen," and l'envoy, "O, Blessed Death." Putting aside the use of inaccurate and exaggerated turns of speech, such as "thy beard is white and wise," "a haggard rest," "and He, the Paraclete, the Son, the Lamb," the chief defect in Mr. Buchanan's poem is a want of humour. The inspired tinker by no means despised his jest, whereas our modern dreamer throughout his pilgrimage—and from one to the other of these uncomfortable cities is a far cry—allows no nonsense by the way.

"Songs, Ballads, and Plays,"² by A. Mary F. Robinson, strike us as

¹ "The City of Dream: an Epic Poem." By Robert Buchanan. London: Chatto & Windus. 1888.

² "Songs, Ballads, and a Garden Play." By A. Mary F. Robinson. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1888.

being less original than "The New Arcadia," which we noticed in the *WESTMINSTER REVIEW* of April 1886. An admirable technique, a refined taste, and an enlightened appreciation of contemporary models go far to make good verses, but they neither hearten the reader nor leave any deep impression on his mind. The burden of Miss Robinson's song, especially when she is most herself, is the Death of Faith. It is a melancholy cry, as monotonous as the cuckoo's, and far less musical. The clever verses on Darwinism do, indeed, let drop some crumbs of comfort, but the keynote of the volume is a tone of melancholy. The spring songs are as sad as dirges, the romantic ballads are tales of direful woe, and the title of the play, the workmanship of which is delicate as a cameo, is "Our Lady of the Broken Heart."

In Sir Edwin Arnold's *Collected Poems* many readers will recognize old favourites. Of some more recent compositions we read with especial pleasure, "The Heavenly Secret" and "An Adieu." If Sir Edwin Arnold's "non-oriental" poems ("non-oriental" is good) are seldom profound, they have the merit of saying what they mean, and meaning what they say. They are as refreshing as a breath of air after long confinement in a crowded room.

We regret that we can only acknowledge the receipt of "Songs of a Revolutionary Epoch,"⁴ by J. L. Joynes; "A Soul's Comedy,"⁵ by Arthur Edward Waite; and "Selections from Tennyson,"⁶ by F. J. Rowe and W. T. Webb.

Though designed to illustrate "certain recent psychical experiences," Mr. Scofield's play⁷ is founded on incidents which occurred in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., and the *dénouement* takes place during the short usurpation of Lady Jane Grey. John Dudley, Viscount L'Isle, afterwards Duke of Northumberland and father-in-law to Lady Jane Grey, covets the lands of Alwynne, Lord Bermyngham, principally to get possession of "The Pleasance of Narboth," about which part of Lord Bermyngham's domain there is a secret, whose existence is known only to the owner and to Lord L'Isle, neither of whom, however, knows more of the secret than that it exists, and that it promises wealth and power to its discoverer. Bermyngham, like Naboth (from whom the name of "Narboth" is apparently derived), refuses to sell his inheritance, and L'Isle lays a plot to obtain it by the ruin of its rightful owner. By infamous practices, and abuse of his vast power, he manages to convict Alwynne of trying, by armed violence, to rob the King's treasure convoy, which, in reality, he was defending from a simulated attack by L'Isle's own men. Alwynne is condemned to death, but by the passionate intercession of Ellen, Countess of Groby (L'Isle's ward, secretly betrothed to Alwynne), his sentence is commuted to perpetual banishment, whilst "Lady Ellen" is immured by her unscrupulous guardian in "The Pleasance of Narboth," which he has secured by the attainder of his enemy. The next act opens at Rhoms, where we find Alwynne, with broken health

³ "Poems Selected from the Works of Sir Edwin Arnold." London: Trübner & Co. 1884.

⁴ "Songs of a Revolutionary Epoch" By J. L. Joynes. London: Foulger & Co. 1888.

⁵ "A Soul's Comedy." By Arthur Edward Waite. London: George Redway. 1887.

⁶ "Selections from Tennyson." With Introduction and Notes. By F. J. Rowe, M.A., and W. T. Webb, M.A. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

⁷ "Alwynne; or, The Secret of Narboth." Being certain actual and recent Psychical Experiences, dramatized in a Play of Four Acts. By Joseph Alan Scofield. London: Wyman & Sons. 1888.

and shattered nerves; labouring to discover from ancient documents "The Secret of Narboth." His unjust and degrading conviction, together with the belief, maliciously instilled into his mind, that "Lady Ellen" is dead, have driven him to the verge of insanity. He hears phantom voices, and sees spectral forms, which unman him, and he can only pursue his self-imposed task by the aid of wine in unmeasured doses. These, we presume, are the "psychical experiences" mentioned in the title-page. We next find him at "Narboth," whose secret he has at length unearthed, and it turns out, so far as we can gather, to be a coal mine. Here he reverses his former "psychical experiences." Instead of taking the phantoms of his clouded brain for realities, he takes real people for phantoms. He also, in darkly veiled words (prophecies are apt to be dark, especially in blank verse), predicts the future greatness of the "black country" in general, and of Dudley Port, which seems to occupy the site of "Narboth," in particular. Finally, he discovers that his old enemy, now Duke of Northumberland, is no phantom; so they fight, and the duke is killed, repenting after Alwynne's sword has transfixed him. The hero is rehabilitated and marries the heroine, and all ends happily. The play is, in our judgment, absolutely unfitted for the stage, but it is not unpleasant reading, though it abounds in anachronism of thought and sentiment, and rings with echoes of greater voices than its author's.

"The Reverberator" ⁸ is a charming little comedy. It turns upon the infinite difference between the American and the French ideals of social and family life. In the United States, individual independence of anything like family dictation is carried to a pitch unknown even in England, and the publication in the newspapers of the most intimate details of private life is taken as a matter of course. In not a few instances the notice of the press is courted rather than resented. In France, the state of feeling and opinion, both as to family life and newspaper indiscretions, is just the reverse, especially in the exclusive ranks of the old French noblesse. There the *solidarité* of the family is a sacred dogma, and the tattling revelations of society papers are an offence and a pollution. In "The Reverberator" Mr. Henry James has exhibited these opposed conditions of social sentiment in action, and brought them face to face with admirable skill and insight. The prevailing note of the story is delicate, subtle humour; but here and there, there is, as in all genuine comedy, a touch of pathos.

"Fraternity" ⁹—a two volume novel by an anonymous writer—belongs to that large class of fiction in which the story is but the vehicle for the author's opinions; but it is a favourable specimen of the genus; for the opinions, ably advocated, are amiable and attractive, though, alas! utterly incapable of realization, and the story is interesting and pleasantly told. A curious feature in the work is that all the principal characters are Welsh, the mottoes prefixed to each of the four "parts" into which it is divided are all taken from the Welsh Triads (very noble sentiments some of them embody), and, from his intimate knowledge of Welsh life and character, we may safely infer that the anonymous author is himself a native of the principality.

Undoubtedly, the misery and degradation of the bargees and their families are a fitting theme for a powerful realistic novel, and it is no less

⁸ "The Reverberator." By Henry James. In two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

⁹ "Fraternity: a Romance." London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

certain that in writing "Life in the Cut" ¹⁰ Mr. Amos Reade has been actuated by the highest and purest motives. But, unhappily, the execution falls far short of the intention. Mr. Reade's literary style contrives to combine most of the faults, positive as well as negative, of which English composition is susceptible. He rarely uses *le mot propre*, and frequently expresses what assuredly he does not mean. The talk of his personages is never characteristic of their class; in the case of uneducated, or imperfectly educated, people, his plan seems to be to introduce plenty of superfluous h's, and to reverse all accepted grammatical forms. The only exception to this simple rule is to be found in the lingo of the bargees, which does bear some marks of being drawn from observation. The story, if it were better told, would not be uninteresting.

A new book by Mr. Frederick Gale ¹¹ is always welcome, for he treats of sport from a point of view at once delightful and wholesome. He never confuses, as do many, both of its champions and its adversaries, between the primary characteristics of sport, which constitute its essence, and the various evils and malpractices which disfigure it like a morbid growth. So, too, in contrasting things past with things present, Mr. Gale is no indiscriminating *laudator temporis acti*; he dwells lovingly and regretfully on many traits of manners, customs, and ways of thinking which prevailed amongst us in his youth; but it will be found that they were things good in themselves, and such as no thinking man can fail to regret. Many of the novelties which have sprung up around his later life are, he freely admits, changes for the better. Most of the articles collected in the present volume had previously appeared in *Baily's Magazine*, including the opening paper, "Tom Spring's Back Parlour," one of the most interesting of the series. "My First Salmon," "The Racing Stable," and "The Pride of Our Village" are especially entertaining. The two last mentioned, and "Tom Spring's Back Parlour," tend to show that neither trainers nor prize-fighters are necessarily rogues or blackguards.

"Paris Bienfaisant" ¹² is a grave book, but not dull; on the contrary, it contains both interesting and instructive reading. It gives a detailed account of the vast amount of useful philanthropic work which is being done in Paris, by men of the most diverse creeds, and of every shade of political opinion. It brings forcibly under our notice a fact which we are too apt to lose sight of, namely, that charity is not exclusively an English virtue. Nearly all the vast works of active beneficence described by M. Maxime Du Camp have been initiated by individual effort, and, in almost every instance, their present efficiency is maintained by the devoted labours of men and women, for the most part belonging to the *bourgeoisie*, who freely give their time, their experience, and their abilities to the service of the most hapless, and, too often, the least deserving, of their fellow-creatures. It would be impossible to find space for anything approaching a *compte-rendu* of M. Du Camp's voluminous and exhaustive work; but the headings of the chapters will afford some slight idea of its scope. The first chapter treats of "L'Œuvre des Libérées de Saint Lazare," the second is headed "Le Patronage des Libérés." In both of these valuable undertakings it will be observed that it is on liberated

¹⁰ "Life in the Cut." By Amos Reade. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1888.

¹¹ "Sports and Recreations in Town and Country." By Frederick Gale (*The Old Buffer*). London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1888.

¹² "Paris Bienfaisant." Par Maxime Du Camp, de l'Académie Française. Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1888.

prisoners that the efforts of the respective organizations are brought to bear. The results, on the whole, do not seem to be discouraging. The third chapter is devoted to "Les Associations Protestantes"; the subject of the fourth is "La Charité d'Israel"; and chapter the fifth and last treats of "L'Assistance par le Travail." Throughout the whole book we are furnished with abundance of facts, not merely statistics, though of them there is no lack, but individual life-stories, which not only give colour and interest to the work, but show how arduous and complicated a thing is charity well bestowed and wisely administered.

"L'Analyse" is, to our thinking, the curse of contemporary French fiction, but we have never seen it carried to such excess as in "Marc Fane."¹³ It is analysis run mad. It leaves no place for action. The characters simply do nothing, and the author watches the process through a microscope. Phenomena, mental and bodily, the most common-place and trivial, are magnified till they become unrecognizable; and M. Rosny is so bent on expressing the inexpressible that, to use a French locution, *il se bat les flancs*, and even coins words whose meaning can be only guessed at, since they are neither to be heard in conversation, nor to be found in dictionaries. At the same time, it must be allowed that, when he does condescend to introduce anything approaching to incident, he rises to the occasion; he still analyzes *à outrance*, but he contrives to convey a clear mental picture of the situation. For instance, in describing the illness and threatened death of a child and the agonized distress of the father, he becomes comparatively simple, and consequently far more effective. It is a pity that M. Rosny sacrifices his unmistakable power and faculty as a novelist to false theories all too rigidly carried out. And, after all, his is not realistic art: nothing can be more fantastically unreal. Realism is the result of observation, and such microscopic observation of moods, feelings, and physical sensations as we see in "Marc Fane" can only be practised on one's self; consequently, all the characters must be drawn from one model, and that by no means a typical one; for a sane man who is willing to pass his life in scanning his inner self to make sport for his readers must necessarily be a most exceptional being.

Professor Morley's "English Writers"¹⁴ is a second edition, greatly enlarged and modified, of a previous work of his on the same subject, now out of print. It is to be published in instalments of one, or at most two, volumes a year, and will probably, as we are informed in the Preface, be completed in about twenty volumes. It is a careful and thoughtful work, the fruit of extensive and varied reading, well digested; but we cannot help thinking that it is somewhat too diffuse, and that the learned professor has been too solicitous to deduce everything *ab ovo*. In the two volumes which we have received, English Literature, in the strict acceptation of the term, has not yet been touched upon, and the mass of mingled and archæological science and myth, of which the greater part of the first volume is composed, is already familiar to the great majority of cultivated readers, through the labours of specialists in the sciences of ethnography and philology. The Introduction, which gives a rapid survey of English writers, from Chaucer to Sir Walter Scott, is interesting, and Professor Morley's judgment on the classics of each age is, for the most part, just and sound, though perhaps rather rigid and *tant*

¹³ "Marc Fane: Roman Parisien." Par J. H. Rosny. Paris: Maisson Quantin. 1898.

¹⁴ "English Writers. An Attempt towards a History of English Literature." By Henry Morley, LL.D., Professor of English Literature at University College, London. Second Edition. London: Cassell & Co. 1887-8.

soit peu puritanical. Probably this tendency may explain his omitting all mention of Sterne; yet he accords unqualified praise to Fielding. But to "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel" is no uncommon feat.

The volume of "The Mermaid Series,"¹⁵ this month forwarded to us for review, contains a selection from the Plays of John Ford. The Introduction and Notes are from the pen of Mr. Havelock Ellis, and are executed with his usual ability and critical acumen. The plays selected are: "The Lover's Melancholy," "'Tis Pity She's a Whore," "The Broken Heart," "Love's Sacrifice," and "Perkin Warbeck."

From "The Camelot Series,"¹⁶ we have received a translation of the "Volsunga Saga," by Messrs. Eirick Magnusson and William Morris, edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by Mr. H. Halliday Sparling. We are quite willing to admit that the English version of the "Volsunga Saga" is curious and interesting, both as folklore and as a document revealing *les mœurs intimes* of a great and heroic race, from admixture with whom we have derived some of our most valuable national characteristics. But we cannot share the opinion, advanced by Mr. Sparling in his Introduction, that the study of the old Norse Sagas and Eddas would form a satisfactory substitute for that of the polished literature of ancient Greece and Rome. Neither can we think that the life of freebooting, carousing, and slaughter, often wanton and purposeless, portrayed in the "Volsunga Saga" is, as the enthusiastic editor styles it, "a healthy life," from which we should do well to "take a few lessons." As to the study of the ancient Norse speech, with a view to "the bettering of our own," we do not feel sure that by calling "the people" "the folk," and writing "adrad" for "in dread," we should "better" our speech. The truth is that the study of ancient Scandinavian literature is an excellent thing, but affectation is *not*.

The "Concise Dictionary of Middle English,"¹⁷ just issued by the Rev. A. L. Mayhew and Professor Skeat, will be a boon to students. Anything like criticism on our part of a work bearing the stamp of such high authority on the subject of which it treats would be a mere impertinence.

The English Dialect Society still actively continues its valuable work. We have two volumes, independent of each other, dedicated to the Cheshire dialect. That by Mr. R. Holland is the third part of his "Glossary of Words Used in the County of Chester."¹⁸ It is not only useful, but extremely entertaining, for besides considerable additions to the list of dialect words, it contains an excellent and really humorous story, told in Cheshire dialect, some capital dialect poems, and an interesting chapter on ancient Cheshire customs.

Mr. Darlington's "Folk-Speech of South Cheshire"¹⁹ is a more severely scientific performance. It seems to us to be a thoroughly good and careful piece of work.

¹⁵ "The Mermaid Series. John Ford." With an Introduction and Notes by Havelock Ellis. London: Vizetelly & Co. 1888.

¹⁶ "Volsunga Saga: the Story of the Volsungs and Niblungs, with certain Songs from the Elder Edda." Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by H. Halliday Sparling. Translated from the Icelandic by Eirik Magnusson and William Morris. London: Walter Scott. 1888.

¹⁷ "A Concise Dictionary of Middle English, from A.D. 1150 to 1580." By the Rev. A. L. Mayhew, M.A., and the Rev. Walter W. Skeat, Lit.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1888.

¹⁸ "Glossary of Words Used in the County of Chester." By Robert Holland, M.B.A.C. Part III. London: Published for the English Dialect Society by Trübner & Co. 1888.

¹⁹ "The Folk-Speech of South Cheshire." By Thomas Darlington, B.A. London: Published for the English Dialect Society by Trübner & Co. 1887.

HOME AFFAIRS.

THE record of the month, if less distinguished than that of last month, continues, in its stream and tendency, to make for the same end. Consequently it is wholly satisfactory to ourselves. We cannot hope to have a Southampton and an Ayr every thirty days, and if we "improve" the opportunities as they occur, at longer or shorter intervals, it is enough. This has been done in the single election which has been fought since we last wrote. And something more has happened. The Opposition Leaders in Parliament have recognized the obligation laid upon them by the triumphs of last month to make a further effort in the interest of Ireland. It may be hoped that the Vote of Censure is but the beginning of a more steadily aggressive policy. In the great controversy of the day a persistent "pegging away" is a bounden duty; and, as long as the constituencies speak hopefully, it ought by no means to be a disagreeable one. Hence we are for fighting the Irish question right through, without decrease of energy or pluck. In this way only can we hope to keep a comparative peace in Ireland during the dreary days of waiting for the better time.

It was said by the enemy, and even by some of the faint-hearted in our own ranks, that Mr. Morley's Vote of Censure was a mistake. We were told it would give fresh cohesion to the Unionist fractions, demoralized by the outburst of their essential antagonisms on the licensing and other subordinate questions. Those who used this argument could hardly have perceived that it postponed indefinitely any action in regard to the Irish policy of the Government. And this was impossible. The imprisonment of Mr. Dillon and the coincidence of the Killeagh case in the Irish Court of Exchequer afforded a great opportunity—an opportunity such as has not occurred since, and may not occur again during the present session. In our judgment the Vote of Censure was not only well-timed, but was in itself a necessity. It was inevitable it should rally the Anti-Irish parties. It would have done this at any time during the present session, and yet no good Home Ruler will readily say that Parliament should have adjourned without a formal demonstration of the abominable tyranny which is being wrought in the name of law in Ireland. This admission then justifies the whole proceeding of the Opposition Leaders. As to the debate itself, it cannot fail to have been useful.

Mr. Morley, speaking in his most judicial manner, piled case upon case in which the Crimes Act had been shamefully misused, and throughout the two nights over which the debate lasted, none of the Ministers made a pretence of meeting his charges. It was natural that the Killeagh case should figure largely in the indictment of the Government. A more extraordinary exhibition than the conduct of the resident magistrates in this prosecution has rarely been seen on the bench. Mr. Gladstone denounced it as on a par with some of the doings of Jeffreys, and very particularly asked if these so-called "justices" were to continue to administer an Act in respect of which their legal knowledge (Heaven save the mark!) is certified by the Lord-Lieutenant. In putting the matter thus broadly, the Leader of the Opposition went hardly a point beyond the emphatic language of the Lord Chief Baron and of Mr. Baron Dowse who heard the appeal in Dublin; and Mr. Goschen, speaking in advance of Mr. Gladstone, admitted there had been a serious miscarriage of justice. Yet Mr. Balfour came forward eager to champion his "Removables." In a state of great mental disturbance, bordering upon passion, he shouted across the table. "I am not going to dismiss them," to the great satisfaction of the bitter partisans behind him, and, as it seemed, of Mr. Chamberlain, who sat opposite, in particular. The Chief Secretary had not a word of apology to the poor men who, according to his own colleague, had been wrongfully imprisoned. This was "only one case," as we were told—the single exception which proved the rule that the Irish resident magistrate was a perfect model of uprightness and capacity. Yet Mr. Morley had given chapter and verse in a dozen or more cases only a trifle less shameful, and Mr. Reid, a lawyer of distinction, had told the House that he and his friends had examined 700 out of 2000 cases of "conspiracy," and had found the proceedings to be "a mere travesty and caricature of justice." Again, it was charged, not only that the magistrates took every opportunity of preventing appeal from their decisions, even refusing to state a case when there was involved a knotty point of law, but that when the Nationalist lawyers went to the Superior Courts to ask for process to compel the magistrates to fulfil a clear obligation, it mattered not how hard the case was upon the appellants, the Crown counsel were always there primed to resist to the last. And this in spite of the solemn pledges in Parliament that every opportunity should be given to accused persons to make appeal. All these allegations—serious enough, one would think, to a really conscientious Minister—were ignored or put aside with a sarcasm, whilst legitimate demands for information, such as Mr. Gladstone's request for the depositions in cases of conspiracy, were met by an impudent refusal.

In Mr. Dillon's case the tactics of the Government were equally disingenuous. They could not deny that they had launched a proclamation *ex post facto* in order to convict him. To indict him under the

common law would give him the advantage of a jury, and as few juries in Ireland can be brought to believe in the criminality of the Member for East Mayo, the Crimes Act must be put into force after the offence has been committed so as to send Mr. Dillon before a couple of resident magistrates. The dodge was sure of success, but it was none the less an unmitigated meanness, quite unworthy of a professing Liberal like Mr. Goschen. Yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer had nothing better to offer in the way of palliation than that Mr. Dillon had before been tried for an admitted offence by a Dublin county jury who disagreed! Mr. Balfour found a characteristic excuse for the action taken in regard to Mr. Dillon. He could not believe, he said, that "there was a particular offence against the law which Mr. Dillon would be delighted to commit if tried by a jury, which he knew would disagree, but which he would not commit if he were not to be so tried!" It is not necessary to go into the contention concerning the character of the evidence upon which the resident magistrates convicted Mr. Dillon; it is enough to show how the honourable gentleman was brought into the meshes of the law by Ministers who pose as the most injured of men. Is it the pricking of conscience that has led to an order that Mr. Dillon shall be allowed the privilege of books whilst he is in the prison infirmary?

The debate showed clearly that the Conspiracy Clauses of the Crimes Act, in the hands of ex-policemen and ex-military officers, are a positive danger to public liberty. Hear the unhappy tradesmen of Killeagh, who, being afraid of possible consequences, refused supplies to the police, and found themselves thrown into gaol for "inducing" certain other persons not to deal. Mr. Balfour is content if he can say that the offending magistrates were appointed by Lord Spencer several years before they were called upon to deal with the intricacies of the law of conspiracy. The Chief Secretary never gets far beyond the *tu quoque*. His capacity for evasion is perhaps improving by frequent efforts in this direction, but his "cocksureness" concerning everything said and done by the Irish authorities is mere affectation. Otherwise, why does he not oblige Mr. Gladstone with the depositions in all cases of conspiracy? Nothing could be easier, and an honest desire to see that justice was done, could be pleaded against that want of precedent in which he takes refuge. Mr. Reid's statement concerning 700 cases in which justice was burlesqued, to the lamentable injury of honest men, ought to give a pang to the most supercilious of Ministers, the more that this Minister has to admit at least one grievous blunder.

One or two other matters revealed in the debate will no doubt be noted by the country. It will be remembered with what joy the Tory party received Mr. Balfour's famous return of sentences increased on appeal during the Liberal Administration of 1880-85, and how Mr. Balfour was supposed to have completely put his

opponents to rout. Yet it was stated by Mr. Morley in moving his Vote of Censure, and it has not been denied, that "on the face of the return it is obvious that in not a single case of proceeding under the Crimes Act, either of 1881 or 1882, was a sentence so increased on appeal." Again the two Ministers with whom mainly rested the defence of the Government each made a most remarkable admission, which, taken together, quite destroy all their boastful claims to success in bringing back order to Ireland. Mr. Goschen, quite too eager in pursuit of the quarry, spoke of "the tremendous and ubiquitous power" of the National League—not in the past but in the present tense—and the Chief Secretary, who pretends to have "smashed" the League, told us, quite unconsciously as it seemed, that in Ireland "Crime depends upon Coercion." A refusal to issue a return of the number of derelict farms taken since the Crimes Act came into operation was not less significant than these avowals. The debate may have given a temporary cohesion to the Government and their allies—for, of the Unionists, Sir Edward Watkin alone deliberately abstained from voting—but it can hardly have failed in its purpose, which was that of focussing the attention of the British elector on the enormities perpetrated in his name beyond St. George's Channel.

Since the Vote of Censure was defeated in the Commons, the Duke of Argyll has earned himself unexpected glory by giving the Government a personal testimonial in the House of Lords. It was an uncommonly pretty comedy in which the Duke figured. His own arrangement, he played all the parts immensely to his own satisfaction. Yet, on reflection, the result neither pleases the Duke nor Lord Salisbury, whom his Grace patted on the back. The Prime Minister shows an extreme sensitiveness about the platform doings of the Opposition leaders which should encourage them. Matter for serious criticism grows apace. At the time of writing the inquest is in progress on the death of Mr. Mandeville. The evidence tendered by four medical men, two of whom saw the deceased in Tullamore, casts grave reflections upon Irish prison administration, whilst the suicide of the prison doctor is terribly significant. If the gaol officials do not succeed in removing the serious impression which the inquiry has so far made upon the public mind, the conclusion that Mr. Mandeville was done to death because he refused to wear the prison dress, to do the menial duties of the cell, and to mix with the ordinary riff-raff of a gaol, will be inevitable. The plea already raised that Mr. Mandeville could have escaped punishment by obeying the regulations will not avail to save the Government from the gravest censure. It is unfortunate for the Chief Secretary that we know something of the method which he proposed to himself in contemplation of his present office. According to Mr. Blunt, he would not repeat Mr. Forster's farce of simply locking up accused persons, and, subject to this, allowing them all necessary comforts.

The Balfourian system was to be "thorough." And "thorough" it was with poor Mandeville. The result, however, cannot be agreeable to Mr. Balfour and his officers. We are vastly deceived if the public conscience does not revolt against the rigours of Tullamore. Some day soon the Chief Secretary will have a rude awakening.

The eviction campaign on the Vandeleur estate in county Clare can hardly fail to hasten the disillusion. Horse, foot, and artillery have been ordered to assist in removing from their homes the better men among the Vandeleur tenantry, and the scenes of Bodyke are being repeated. Yet the matter in dispute is by general admission a mere bagatelle. The suspicion is natural that a settlement is postponed merely for the purpose of striking an effective blow at the organization which enables the tenantry to make headway against the landlords. Combination among tenants is distasteful to the Irish rent-collector, and the Government, with all the Executive machinery, including the summary jurisdiction clauses of the Crimes Act, is brought in to crush it. Already Mr. Balfour claims to have thrice defeated the Plan of Campaign. He gives the names of the estates and adheres to his statement, though Mr. William O'Brien declares that he has never heard of two of the places indicated. Recently there have been showers of "paper" evictions in Ireland, and, as we approach the autumn, there will be more and more work for Mr. Balfour of the type he is now carrying out in Clare. To serious men in Ireland the prospect is really alarming. The Roman Catholic prelacy, who know the necessities of the country as well as anybody, have formulated a joint demand for an Arrears Bill as the one thing essential to get safely through the winter months. They ask that the Land Courts shall have the power of the Scotch Crofters' Commission, and a more reasonable claim could not be made. The Government, however, close their ears. They offer a series of Drainage Bills for the Bann, the Barrow, and the Shannon, but intimate, in the same breath, that any serious opposition will be fatal to these measures. We are also to have a Bill making another grant from the English Treasury in order to keep alive Lord Ashbourne's Land Purchase Scheme, the financial arrangements of which are about as unsound as they can be. But the one matter for which the Irish people care—this is not to be granted.

To be done with Ireland. It is to be noted that the Papal Rescript against boycotting and the Plan of Campaign is still in suspense. The Pope's letter explanatory of the reasons which moved him to the Decree has been called an apology, and it certainly goes a long way in that direction. It protests vigorously against the unjust suspicion which finds him wanting in sympathy for the national aspirations of the Irish people, and begs for rather than commands the obedience of the faithful to the decree of the Holy Inquisition. Whether the promulgation of the Decree will now take

place remains to be seen, but so far the Papal injunction against the weapons of the National League has been exclusively for the priests and not for the people. The situation is a remarkable one, as touching the powers and prerogatives of the Pope, and should convince those stout "Protestants" of the North of Ireland that Home Rule would not necessarily establish the Pope as King in Ireland.

Upon the greater question of public controversy we have a notable letter from Mr. Parnell to Mr. Cecil Rhodes, a Cape politician, who had pleaded for such a constitution for Ireland as would facilitate the federation of the Empire. The Irish leader, in reply, wrote that the exclusion of the Irish members in Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill was "a defect," giving colour to the unjust accusations that the Bill had a separatist tendency. He is at one with Mr. Rhodes in requiring effective safeguards for the maintenance of Imperial unity, and his own belief is that, if Mr. Gladstone in his next Home Rule Bill should include provisions for the retention of the Irish members at Westminster, "the Irish party would cheerfully concur in them, and accept them in good will and good faith, with the intention of taking their share in the Imperial partnership." Since this letter was published Mr. Gladstone has made reference to the same subject, and, recalling his speech at Sir Hussey Vivian's place in South Wales last recess, has indicated that he long ago accepted the principle of the retention of the Irish members. The great thing is in the public avowal that Mr. Parnell is prepared to accept from Mr. Gladstone any proper amendment of the Bill of 1886. The fact was never doubted by those who knew anything of the inner life of the Irish party, but it is as well for the sake of the Unionists, some of whom, at any rate, based their opposition to Home Rule upon this particular point, that the thing should be put upon record. Whether it will influence Mr. Chamberlain and his set to any more rational position in this controversy is, however, sufficiently problematical.

The Government, being desperately behind in their work about the middle of the month, appropriated all the time of the House, and, whilst talking of an autumn session, began "the massacre of the innocents." Among the Bills definitely dropped were the unhappy "King Harman Bill," the twin Bills for a shewn reform of the House of Lords, and the Technical Education Bill. Mr. Balfour showed more than his usual wisdom in consenting to sacrifice the Bill for providing the salary of a Parliamentary Under-Secretary to the Irish Office, and we have now very probably heard the last of this needless proposal. Of course it was necessary to go on with the Local Government Bill, but Mr. Smith intimated that the Bill would be further lightened by dropping the clauses setting up the subordinate county authorities—the district councils. The London clauses would be kept, and when the Bill and Supply had been disposed of it was hinted that the House might possibly rise for a holiday,

coming back at the end of October to conclude the work of the session. The Leader of the House thought it was necessary to pass a good many more or less useful Bills (including the Bills which had been examined by the Grand Committees), but it is certain that his hopes cannot be wholly realized, and a further massacre will no doubt be shortly announced. The hope of an early holiday did great things to quicken the pace in the work of the House. In three sittings nearly a hundred clauses of the Local Government Bill were got through, and the measure is now in smooth water. It has, however, been so emasculated in passing through Committee that, according to Sir William Harcourt, the county councils will be little better in the extent of their jurisdiction than "an old turnpike trust."

Of course the councils have no power of any sort over public-houses, for the teetotal Unionists found it quite easy to vote against the Sunday Closing Clause. They talk at large about "Imperial Sunday closing," but they may yet be glad to take Sunday closing through the county councils. The permissive increase of the licence duties by 20 per cent. has also disappeared from the Bill. Again, Mr. Chaplin was able to insert amendments which wiped out clauses transferring to the county councils certain powers of the central Government, and which ordered that these powers should be given by Orders in Council and with the consent of Parliament. It is distinctly provided that the county councils shall not have any hand in education, that they shall not be able to lend to the subordinate authorities within their areas, and that their own borrowing shall never exceed one-tenth of the rateable value of the county. There has been great complaint of the financial arrangements proposed under the Bill, which are admittedly so defective that a roving commission is to be appointed, to put matters between the towns and the counties on an equitable basis. *Per contra*, one or two useful little reforms have been accomplished in the Bill. The appointment of the coroners is to be removed from the freeholders to the county councils, and the power of the Corporation of the City of London to appoint its own judges—Recorder, Common Serjeant, and Commissioner—which has led to canvassing by candidates and much consequent scandal, is transferred to the Crown. If the London county council is to have aldermen, they are to be in the proportion of one-sixth of the directly elected members, not one-third, as in the other cases. There is, unhappily, no change in the metropolitan police arrangements, so as to give direct local control; and the exact position of the country police, under the joint committee of the magistrates and the county council, has yet to be defined. In a speech at Sir Wilfrid Lawson's, Mr. Gladstone has spoken well of the amended Bill as far as it goes, but he hints that the next Liberal Government will have a good deal of "filling in" to do to make it a really comprehensive measure.

This is sufficiently obvious, since Mr. Ritchie will promise no further measure for next year, save such as will be necessary to create the subordinate authorities of the counties—the district councils. Licensing has to stand over indefinitely, and with it the division of the rates between the owner and occupier, which some years ago Mr. Goschen advocated with fervour.

As an outcome of the action "*O'Donnell v. Walter*," heard in the Queen's Bench before Lord Coleridge, the charges and allegations of the *Times* against Mr. Parnell and others will at length be brought to a competent tribunal for investigation. These charges are notorious. Mr. O'Donnell's case was somehow badly managed, and he failed to establish the contention that he was one of "the constitutional leaders" of the Irish Party, who were admittedly libelled. Had the case been properly put before the Court, we might by this time have known the exact character of the wicked letters published by the *Times* as the handiwork of Mr. Parnell, Mr. Egan, and others. Mr. Parnell was ready to go into the box, and attended for two days, expecting to be called for the plaintiff. When the case was over, he promptly repudiated the whole of the *Times*' letters as "palpable and undoubted" forgeries, and Mr. McCarthy was able to support him in denying that the Irish leader found the money by which Frank Byrne made his escape from the country after the Phoenix Park tragedy. Subsequently Mr. Parnell from his place in Parliament renewed his demand for a Select Committee, and suggested that the Committee should be wholly composed of English and Scotch members. Mr. Smith declined to give a committee, and in the fashion of last year referred Mr. Parnell to the Courts. Mr. Parnell became pressing, and suddenly, at the instigation of the Liberal Unionists as it is presumed, the Government turned round and offered a Special Commission of three judges of the High Court. The offer was accepted in principle, but when the Bill for founding the Commission was printed, it was discovered that the Commission was to inquire into the charges and allegations made against certain members of Parliament "and other persons." It has been suggested that the last words were an after-thought, and certain it is that the House of Commons has primarily only to do with its own members. But it was necessary to give the *Times*—which does not relish the Commission—a free hand, and hence the Bill neither fixed the line of inquiry nor the time over which the investigation should range. Mr. Parnell's anxiety is for his own reputation and that of his Parliamentary colleagues, and he was naturally angry that a Bill so drawn should be thrown at him to accept or leave, "as he pleased." There may be no foundation for the suspicion that the Government and the *Times* are in collusion on this matter, but it is noteworthy that the Attorney-General, who was counsel for the *Times* in the O'Donnell case, was at a Cabinet meeting when the Commission Bill might

have been before Ministers. Clearly the Government ought to limit the "reference" in the case, and to strike out of the Bill the words "other persons." Otherwise the inquiry may be interminable, and by its very length do much prejudice to Mr. Parnell, who is not a wealthy man. When the *Times* complains about being placed at a disadvantage, it may be retorted that it saves itself any pecuniary or penal risks in taking the Commission. A criminal suit for libel or a civil action has possible consequences which do not appertain to the decision of the Commission of judges. All that can happen to the *Times*—for subsequent proceedings are barred—is to fall into hopeless disgrace and discredit by being put under the stigma of resorting to a policy of moral assassination in order to defeat a political opponent.


The other events and incidents of the month will bear rapid survey. In the Thanet election too much was expected, and the fact that Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen reduced the Tory majority of 1885, when the Irish question was not before the constituencies, must be accounted highly satisfactory. Progress is going on elsewhere. The House of Commons has given three rather notable votes. Dr. Cameron's motion for the disestablishment of the Scottish Kirk was rejected by 52 only in a House of 168 members, the majority having fallen from 112 in 1886. Seven Liberal Unionists, including Mr. Chamberlain, went with the Disestablishers. Since then Mr. T. Ellis has proposed to apply the Irish land system to Wales (this is what the demand for a measure to fix fair rents really amounts to), and has been defeated by 18 votes only. Mr. Fenwick's proposal to return to the ancient usage of Parliament in paying members for their services obtained a sympathetic word from Mr. Gladstone, and was rejected by 192 to 135. All these things show that Parliament, though much behind the constituencies, is really moving. The same sign ought to have been more completely observed in the division on the Channel Tunnel Bill. Mr. Smith promised Sir E. W. Watkin that the question should be left an open one with the Conservatives; but the President of the Board of Trade made a hostile "military" speech, and the Government whips were found "whipping" against the tunnel. The debate was, however, very satisfactory, and Mr. Gladstone's speech in favour of the project was one of the most interesting he has delivered for a long time. Mr. Bradlaugh's Oaths Bill is also distinctly a measure of progress. An unfortunately worded amendment, for which the Member for Northampton was hardly responsible, will no doubt be remedied later on; and with the passing of the Bill an ugly and in some respects a disgraceful controversy will be finally laid to rest. Henceforward it will be possible for any man in these realms, who does not act of mere frivolity, to make an affirmation instead of taking the oath. It is pleasant to know that the misunderstanding which has arisen on the

Bill between Mr. Bradlaugh and his friends has not been allowed to go to extremes.

The agitation on the question of the national defences seems to slacken, and it must be said that the Government have so far held their own in regard to it. Lord Wolseley has given up the contention, which we supposed to be his, that a French force of 100,000 men might be gathered on the other side of the Channel, and be landed on the south coast of England, within twenty-four hours, so as to lay London open to seizure by surprise. He does not think that the thing can be done in a single night; and the Prime Minister, upon this supposed concession by the Adjutant-General, declares that the thing cannot be done at all. Lord Napier of Magdala is, however, with Lord Wolseley, in proclaiming that we are liable to invasion at any time, for the reason that we cannot depend upon the fleet to be in any given place at any given time. Meantime, an interesting experiment in naval mobilization has been rapidly and successfully accomplished, in getting ready, within a fixed period, the Channel and Reserve Squadrons for a series of manœuvres, in which it is proposed to solve certain very nice questions in naval tactics. Last year a supposed enemy was allowed to leave his ports with the notion that he could be beaten at sea, but the result was not very satisfactory to the British defending force. Now it is to be seen whether it is not more promising plan to blockade him in his ports.

The gratifying announcement is made that the Zulu outbreak, which at one time threatened awkward things, is showing less seriously; meantime Lord Salisbury gives it as his opinion that the Zambesi must be retained as a free river, spite of the exclusive claims of Portugal. Once again, the troublesome Trafalgar Square question is "hung up" pending a decision upon the whole case in the Superior Courts. In previous cases the right of public meeting in the square has really never been tried, though the judges have delivered *obiter dicta* apparently hostile to the public claim.

The Third Lambeth Conference and the Pan-Presbyterian Council have been held simultaneously in London. It is reported that the presbyters and bishops fraternized in some sort, each body offering prayer for the welfare and success of the members of the other. Here, again, we find that, spite of everything, the world is getting on. The fight for shibboleths and creeds may retard, but cannot prevent, the march of humanity.



THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1888.

THE Local Government Bill has become the Local Government Act, amid a chorus of congratulations on both sides almost as great as that with which it was introduced. But happily for very different, and perhaps more substantial, reasons. Mr. Ritchie has been congratulated on the tact and temper which he has shown in piloting the Bill through Parliament, because he has in effect given up almost every point on which there was any difference of opinion. He has lightened the ship by throwing overboard almost everything to which, when the Bill itself was first introduced, we took objection as illiberal, and where he did not throw overboard the cargo altogether, he has kept it on board by concessions, voluntary or involuntary, which go far to remove any bad character it might have possessed.

In May last we denounced the licensing clauses with their preposterous recognition of a claim to a preposterous compensation as likely to be a dead letter, "if intended as anything more than an attempt to catch temperance votes;" and we invoked the Liberal party to throw them out as hopeless of transformation into anything better. The use made of the licensing clauses in the Thanet election showed that their main object was to try and catch temperance votes. Having partly served their purpose, they were thrown out by Mr. Ritchie under pressure from the Liberal party, while the contemptible action of Mr. Caine on the Sunday Closing clause shows what reliance may be placed on the Liberal principles of so-called Liberal Unionists when the interests of the Conservative party and their main supporters, the publicans, have to be considered.

We protested, too, against the exclusion of the parishes from the Bill, and against the inclusion of district councils, while the boards of guardians were left untouched side by side with them. We urged the Liberal party to press for parish vestry reform, and the merger of the boards of guardians in the district councils; and we said: "If the Government refuse to abolish the guardians and transfer their powers to the district councils, it would be far better to cut the district councils out of the Bill altogether, and leave them to be dealt with by some one who had more courage and consistency than the half-hearted promoters of the present Bill." The Government refused to adopt either parochial reform or the merger of the boards of guardians, and we are glad to say that they have consequently had to abandon

the whole of Part III. of their Bill, dealing with district councils. They have promised a separate Bill on the same subject. They should be held to their promise. But no Bill which does not transfer the power of the boards of guardians, which of all our local bodies, with their property qualifications, their vicious system of election, and their *ex officio* members, stand most in need of reform, ought to be allowed to pass. And such a Bill must extend to London, and include a reform of the London vestries and boards of guardians, and especially of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, which has given rise to scandals as great, though unfortunately they were not made as public, as those of the Metropolitan Board of Works itself. At the same time, of course, that degenerate piece of antiquity and iniquity, the Corporation of the City, with its paraphernalia, ought to be abolished, and its powers, dignities, and privileges transferred to the London County Council, while the physical City should be placed on the same level, and governed in the same way, as the other districts into which London is divided. But it is hopeless to expect any reform of this last kind from our present masters. All that can be done is to pledge every member of the new London County Council to use his utmost efforts in that direction. It will be for the interest of every member of that council to put an end to the farce of pretending that some petty publican or discredited architect in an obscure ward of the old City, elected by a few dozen shopkeepers, represents the wealth, the intelligence, or the power of the capital of the Empire and the greatest city in the world.

But whatever the Government may determine to do or to leave undone in regard to the City of London, it is certain that their Bill for District Councils will be a very much better Bill, because a much more liberal and far-reaching Bill, than if they had not, in spite of all their majority, been beaten in argument and whipped and scourged by the Opposition into withdrawing their miserable proposals of this year.

The Government are also practically pledged to do something in the way of the division of rates between owner and occupier, and the discussion on the question has distinctly advanced the prospects of the eventual taxation of ground-rents in London. But it must be confessed that on the financial part of the Local Government Bill but little effect has been produced by the Opposition. The probate duties are to be used to subsidize the landlords at the expense of the general taxpayer, and though as a makeweight the succession duty has been slightly increased, it is much to be feared that the difficulty of dealing with the death duties in a thorough and statesman-like manner has been greatly increased by mixing the question up with that of Local Government. Similarly, the Excise duties have been made more difficult to deal with by the connection now established between them and local finance. However, in these days we

must be thankful for small mercies. It is something to have put an end to the grants in aid dependent on the fluctuating pressure of squeezable members of Parliament, and to have laid down something approaching to a system, even if the system leaves much to be desired.

Taken as a whole, and considering alike what has been left out and what has been left in, the Local Government Act is to the Liberal party a satisfactory result of the Session of 1888. We said when the Bill was introduced that it was worth having, merely for the sake of two clauses—the 2nd, setting up the County Councils; and the 36th, abolishing the Metropolitan Board of Works, and establishing a central municipality for London; and we urged the Liberal party to fix its attention on those central points and insist on their becoming law. The 127 sections of the Local Government Act 1888 are practically little more than an amplification of those two clauses. With one exception, every other objection of importance which we took to the constitution and powers of the councils has been carried or conceded. The one exception is that of the selected councillors. That this anomalous, antiquated, and absurd institution has been retained in the Act, though happily in a modified form, under the name of county aldermen, is due partly to the perverse proclivities of Mr. H. H. Fowler, who on this and another important point of the Bill has shown himself less logical and liberal than his party had a right to expect. Because Mr. Fowler and some other of the middle-class borough members in the House have themselves, or their relations and friends, been saved the trouble and expense of contested municipal elections by the anti-democratic invention of aldermen in boroughs, they have become blind to the oligarchical and reactionary principle which underlies the institution, and therefore they protested but faintly, if at all, against its introduction into the County Councils. The truth is that Lord Lyndhurst's far-seeing device has been successful. Privilege anywhere and everywhere sides with privilege, and Lord Lyndhurst's creation of the privileged class of aldermen in 1835, though that class mainly consists of nominal Liberals, has enabled Lord Lyndhurst's spiritual successors to spoil the democratic measure for the creation of county councils in 1888 by the creation of a similar privileged class. Unfortunately, the power of the privileged class and the chances of its being elected from the privileged classes in the counties, is far greater than in the boroughs. We cannot therefore congratulate Mr. H. H. Fowler in having successfully helped Mr. Ritchie in giving the lie to his own declaration before the Bill was printed, that there should only be one door into the County Council, and that the door of popular election. Happily, however, in London the Conservative members not being of the aldermanic class, combined with the Liberal members to restrict the proportion of aldermen to one-sixth instead

of one-fourth, and London will thus be far less committed to the extension of this stupid piece of reactionary privilege than the rest of the country; and as Birmingham in detestation of its aldermanic gang of deserters from the Liberal party may soon join with London in moving for the complete removal of this disfiguring feature of our so-called democratic local governments, it may be hoped that it will not long endure. One amelioration of the Municipal Corporations Act has, too, been introduced in this matter by forbidding the county aldermen to vote in the election of aldermen, so that a bare majority of the elected members, if they act together, will be able to fill the vacancies in the aldermanic body instead of being voted down by the unrepresentative body. The drowning of the popular voice by the select gentry may not therefore be quite so effective in the county councils as in the municipal boroughs. In this regard we are glad that the Government adhered to their original proposal of making all the councillors go out together, and though it would have been better if the term had been shortened from three to two years, yet it is far more likely that the popular voice will make itself heard in a complete re-election every three years than under the detestable system of retirement by thirds every year. It is this last system which prevents the municipal boroughs and London vestry elections from being conducted as fair stand-up fights on principles and parties, and tends to turn them into wire-pulling arrangements of persons and interests.

Another minor improvement in the Bill may be noted in the abolition of the property qualification of the chairman, and the curtailment of his term of office—in spite of the rejection of Mr. Conybeare's amendment to that effect—from three years to one year.

The Bill has also been considerably liberalized by the transfer in the Act to the county council of the preparation and revision of the basis or standard of the county rate; in other words, of the valuation. Though rating appeals are still left to the county justices, this transfer ought to secure at least some reform in the system of valuation of the country palaces of dukes, earls, and country gentlemen, who now, to the detriment of their poorer neighbours, escape so large a share of the local rates through under-valuations.

But the greatest triumph of the Liberal party and Liberal principles in regard to the county councils has been the transfer of the control of the chief constable from the justices to the joint committee of the justices and the county council. The arrangement is of course absurd, and will work badly. But it is a miracle of logic and good sense compared with the preposterous proposal which we condemned in the original Bill, of vesting the payment and management of the police in a joint committee of the justices and the council, while the appointment, control, and dismissal of

the chief constable, which is really the main part of the control of the police, was left to the county justices. Everybody except the Government, under the sinister influence of Lord Salisbury, who openly declared his preference for the Continental system of central control of the police, and the ultra Tories, from love of the great unpaid, saw the mischievous absurdity of this divided control. The concentration of the police powers in the joint committee is the first step towards its concentration in the county councils alone. The further step is one which the next Liberal Government ought to take in the golden moments of its first session. Lord Salisbury and the reactionaries look to the despotic or bureaucratic system of the Continent for light and leading. All Liberals, and those Conservatives who are really upholders of the Constitution they profess to venerate, look upon local control of the police by local responsible bodies as the essence of the English Constitution, and prefer to seek their models rather in the great Republic of the West and our own self-governing colonies than in the police-ridden despotisms of Europe. The effects of the European system may be seen in the Mitchelstown massacre and Trafalgar Square, and they are not encouraging to those who love either liberty or order. Mr. John Morley gained a notable victory when he beat the Government on this vital point, and we look to him to take the necessary consequential step of removing the justices altogether from interference with the police in the counties, and transferring the Metropolitan police to the London council by the aid of the Liberal majority at the next election. The judicial functions of the justices are a different matter. Mr. Seale-Hayne's amendment, defeated only by a majority of fifty-one, that the county councillors shall be J.P.s, and exercise their functions, is, in our opinion, the proper solution of the whole question of county magistrates. But if, on the Conservative theory, the judicial and administrative functions are to be divided between the J.P.s and the council, then there can be no question that the J.P.s ought not to interfere at all in the control of the police, which is essentially an administrative function and has nothing judicial in it. If the great unpaid were paid judges no one would any more dream of giving them the control of the police than any one dreams of giving it to the Metropolitan police magistrates. If the Government followed the precedent they proposed to set before themselves of the Municipal Corporations Acts, they would of course have vested the police management in the county council. The present complicated and half-hearted compromise is the usual result of Tory reform. Mr. Ritchie, at all events, must be thankful to Mr. John Morley for having at least made the compromise workable at all.

On the other hand, we have to regret that two Liberals—Sir Lyon Playfair from the professional and scientific and Mr. H. H. Farrer

from the aldermanic standpoint—have in one important respect seriously damaged and de-liberalized the Act. In the Bill Mr. Ritchie proposed to transfer outright to the county councils a large number of functions now performed by Government offices. This transfer was but a miserable tithe of the measure of decentralization proposed in Sir Charles Dilke's draft Bill, which would have certainly been carried had the penultimate Liberal Government not lost itself, under Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain's guidance, among the fleshpots of Egypt, and spent its strength wandering in the wilderness of the Soudan.

Even Mr. Ritchie's proposed transfer, meagre as it was, represented an important principle and set an important precedent. Owing, however, to the foolish fears entertained by Sir Lyon Playfair for his medical brethren and for sanitary reform, and to the short-sighted opportunism of Mr. H. H. Fowler, no transfer at all has been effected, but only power given to effect such transfer by provisional orders, to be confirmed and no doubt debated by Parliament. Thus, an important reform which could have been easily carried out with but little extra trouble or talk as part of a large measure, and swallowed accordingly by the House of Lords, will be divided, delayed, and endangered in a number of small measures. For, in the first place, there will be the initial difficulty in getting the departments, and bodies concerned to prepare such measures of transfer on a sufficiently liberal scale, and then there will be the difficulty of driving a series of such measures through not only the Lower but the Upper House. That this result should have been brought about by the interference of Liberal members, actuated by distrust of the people and popular government, is greatly to be regretted, alike in the interests of the party and the country. Their action has largely contributed to the result that the county council runs considerable danger of dying of inanition, and becoming contemptible as a machine created with immense labour and care merely to mend the roads and prevent a few bridges from tumbling down. Especially this action has been of evil omen for the transfer immediately of the functions of the guardians to the district councils, on the importance of which we have already enlarged, and the eventual transfer of the business of the School Boards in London and other towns to the county councils, and of the country to the district councils. Mr. Mundella, indeed, appears to reprobate the latter course, but it is inevitably and obviously the right one. Already the School Board elections, even in London, are becoming the happy hunting-ground of loquacious vestrymen and second parsons. It is much to be feared that a general reaction will ensue when the School Board, hitherto the only popularly elected body of London as a whole, sinks, as in the opinion of the *Times* it has already sunk, into a subordinate position by comparison with the county council.

Manchester and Sheffield and other towns already show indications of the same tendency. The way to correct it and to ensure that public opinion shall have its due weight in elementary education, as in other matters, is to add the duties of the School Board to the other duties of local government, and impose them on the same public body. Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. John Morley, and Sir William Harcourt have perceived this truth and acted upon it. When the second scheme of the Local Government Act comes to be published, it is to be hoped that no fads or the fancied interests of medicine or education will prevent Mr. Mundella and Sir Lyon Playfair and Mr. H. H. Fowler from showing that trust in the people which is the essence of the creed they profess, and endeavouring to make our local governments as popular, as strong, and as respected as possible by enlarging their functions and sphere of action to include all matters of local administration.

It is much to be regretted from this point of view that the number of members of the various county councils was not scheduled to the Act, but has been left to the discretion of the Local Government Board. That Board is more liberal in its views than many public offices. But no one who really has any inside knowledge of what permanent officials are like can suppose that such a matter will be dealt with in anything but a bureaucratic spirit. The fact that the Board proposed to assign only seventy-eight members to the London council is significant of the spirit in which the matter has been approached by Mr. Ritchie and his official advisers. Even the Conservative members for London poured scorn on such a proposal, which would have re-established the Metropolitan Board of Works under another name, and they promptly insisted on the numbers being doubled. The matter has now been settled, at all events for the present, by the adoption of their proposal. But the number is not nearly large enough for a town the size of London. It barely gives two members for each of the Parliamentary divisions with a population of 70,000 or more in each. The electoral areas are so large that none but men of means or those who have some personal financial interest to serve will be able to contest them—a great, and probably an intended, disadvantage to the Liberal party. The number of the council, too, will be so small that the work will be exceedingly onerous, and no one who is to devote the greater portion of his time to it will be able to serve—another disadvantage to the party which is to be largely composed of men more distinguished for their activity and public spirit than for their wealth and leisure. Besides that, the smallness of the council makes it so easily corrupt, and the more amenable to the influence of rings. The House of Commons owes its existence in great part to the fact that being so large in number, there were always some members whom no one could terrify and no Minister could

it had not been for the large number of the Common Council of the City, it would probably long ago have perished. Yet with all the experience before him of the danger of small boards, as seen in the Metropolitan Board of Works and Asylums Board, Mr. Ritchie deliberately proposed 78 members for the whole of London and 120 for the whole of Lancashire with their five millions of population. In Lancashire, with fourteen and a half county boroughs taken out, the number, though now reduced to 105, is not at first sight so inadequate as that proposed for London; but considering the greater difficulties in the way of collecting the members in one place, the practical effect would be quite as bad. It is a bureaucratic and oligarchical notion that the smaller the assembly the better the work done. Experience is against it. As soon as any governing body becomes too large for conversation, the larger it is within possibilities of debate the better. Sir William Harcourt's proposed number of 240 members for the London council, adapted from that of the Common Council of the City, was not a bit too large to ensure free criticism and full discussion. Indeed it was, if anything, too small for the necessary committee work to be done. At no distant date—the abolition of the City Corporation will be a convenient time—we hope that the London council will be increased to at least 300. We hope that the democratic members for Lancashire and Yorkshire—and in the latter county at least they mercifully predominate—will see to it that no Tory or official distrust of popular assemblies will allow the effect of a great institution to be whittled away by the narrow number of members allotted to it. Circumstances have driven Lord Salisbury and his obsequious House of Lords to swallow whole without attempting to mutilate a great measure of reform: we ought not to let it be prevented by a side-blow from having its full democratic effect.

But whatever may be finally settled in this matter, we have at least in the Local Government Act 1888 the first instalment of long-looked-for legislation in the direction of devolution and the restoration to the people outside the boroughs of the management of their own local affairs. It will rest very much with the people themselves, the interest they take in the first elections, and the political character of the representatives they choose, not only whether this first instalment shall be made the preparation for the satisfactory nature of the next instalment, but also whether the county councils themselves shall be efficient instruments of popular government.

PARISIAN SOCIETY.¹

"L'IMMORTEL" is, before all else, a bitter satire on the French *Académie*, a satire not altogether undeserved. For it cannot be doubted that the great institution founded by Richelieu, and which has so long been the supreme arbiter of all that concerns the French language and literature, has entered upon a period of decadence. Its claims to confer immortality have begun to be disputed, and, what in Paris is far more damaging, to be ridiculed. M. Alphonse Daudet has long been known as a leader in this iconoclastic movement, holding in equally light esteem the awards and the prohibitions of the *Académie*, and ever consistently declining to become a candidate for one of its much coveted *fauteuils*. Nevertheless, even from him, we should hardly have expected such a *charge à fond* on the time-honoured *Institut* as is contained in *L'Immortel*. In a lesser man, the undisguised and bitter hostility of the attack might be ascribed to personal rancour—that blackest of all rancour which springs from mortified vanity. But the fame of the illustrious author of the *Nabab* so far transcends the petty currency conferred by a mere official hall-mark, that it would be not only unfair but absurd to suspect M. Daudet of resenting the fact that the honours which he has refused to solicit have not been forced upon him. It is more reasonable to suppose that his contemptuous denunciation of the *Institut*, and all that pertains to it, is the deliberate expression of his opinion.

A supposed article, "Astier-Réhu," from the *Dictionnaire des Célébrités Contemporaines*, forms a most skilful *entrée en matière*. It gives the luckless "Immortel's" own version of his life and literary achievements, for each biographical notice in the *Dictionnaire* is furnished by its subject. By his own account, then, "Astier, dit Astier-Réhu (Pierre-Alexandre-Léonard)," born in 1816, of humble peasants, at Sauvagnat (Puy-de-Dôme) showed from his earliest years rare aptitude for history. "De solides études, comme on n'en fait plus maintenant," commenced at the *Collège de Riom*, and terminating at the *Ecole Normale Supérieure*, won him the *chaire d'histoire* at the Lycée of Mende, and there he produced the first of that series of brilliant historical works, each in turn "*couronné par l'Académie*

¹ *L'Immortel: Mœurs Parisiennes*. Par Alphonse Daudet. Paris: Alphonse Lemerre, Editeur. 1888.

Française," which finally, when the *Académie* had no more "crowns" to bestow, gained him admittance to the charmed circle of the "Immortels." He was, he says, "*déjà un peu de la maison*," having married Mlle. Réhu, daughter and granddaughter of Academicians, her grandfather, "*le vénérable Paul Réhu*," being still alive and the actual *doyen* of the *Académie*. The biographical notice winds up with a flourish about the "noble *disintéressement*" with which M. Astier-Réhu had resigned his office, as "*Archiviste des Affaires Etrangères*," rather than submit his pen and the impartiality of history to "*les exigences de nos gouvernants actuels*." In the version subjoined by his scaring biographer, M. Daudet, we learn that, so far from resigning his honourable and lucrative post, M. Astier was summarily dismissed—"mis à pied comme un simple cocher de fiacre"—for an unlucky phrase in his *Histoire de la Maison d'Orléans*, where he spoke of France "being submerged under the flood of demagogism." As for his academic triumphs, they were due, not to the splendour of his literary achievements—wearisome performances which nobody read—but to the shameless but clever intrigues of his wife, a fact of which the poor pompous, thick-witted "immortel" had no suspicion, as was proved by his naively remarking on the singularity of his wife's *redettes* so often smelling of tobacco, whereas he never smoked. "Un mot, mon cher," as his wife cruelly tells him in their last interview, "*qui vous a rendu plus célèbre que tous vos livres*." He is, no doubt, a poor specimen of humanity; selfish, avaricious, sordidly ambitious, almost devoid of natural affections; laborious indeed, but *parfaitement nul*. Yet, unhappily, he is one of the least odious characters in the book. Madame Astier-Réhu is a very monster of perversity: entirely unscrupulous, mercenary, scheming, treacherous, and pitiless. Her love for her son is her one soft spot. It cannot be called a redeeming quality, for in its modes of manifestation it is rather the devotion of a vicious slave and accomplice than the love of a mother. It ennobles neither the giver nor the recipient, for it neither yields nor inspires confidence or respect. The son, Paul Astier, is one of the new school whom the Parisians have christened "*nos jolis petits struggleurs*;" young men who attempt to justify the most ferocious egoism and unscrupulous avidity by invoking the sanction of Darwin's law of the struggle for existence. To what base uses may great ideas be put! In the opening chapter we are present at an interview between this well-matched mother and son. The likeness of their characters is seen in their personal resemblance:—"La même taille souple, l'œil gris impénétrable, et dans les deux visages une tache légère, à peine visible; le nez fin, un peu dévié, donnant l'expression narquoise, quelque chose de pas sûr." The object of Paul's visit is to try to procure from, or through, his mother ten thousand francs, of which he stands in pressing need, to support his

hand-to-mouth life of ill-gotten and precarious luxury. He never approaches her with any better motive than "*lui tirer des carottes*," and she, in her debased and perverted maternal love, is ready to resort to any infamy, or even to commit a crime, to minister to his slightest whim. In the conversation which ensues between them, in which, natural and spontaneous as it seems, every word is skilfully adapted at once to bring out the character of the interlocutors, and to advance the story, we hear, for the first time, of a group of personages destined to play important parts in the drama. The Princess de Rosen is a young, rich, and beautiful widow, whose husband had been killed in the expedition of Christian of Illyria. Her grief, at first no doubt deep and genuine, has degenerated into a silly routine of observances comprising nearly every fantastic unreality capable of making a mockery of sorrow, such, for instance, as her daily letter addressed to "*Herbert, au Ciel*." Another, and less unreasonable, manifestation of her devotion to the lost "*Herbert*" was the erection of a gorgeous and costly mausoleum, the details and decorations of which, as the thing turned by degrees from a pious solemnity into a plaything, were for ever being changed and countermanded. Now Paul Astier was by profession an architect, and having obtained a certain vogue, from his mother's great relations in Society, and his own good looks and apparent affluence, he was entrusted by the youthful *princes* with the construction of the famous mausoleum. The young people were thus much thrown together. Paul made the most of his opportunities, for, like all his tribe, his one ambition was "*lever une femme riche*." On her side, Madame de Rosen thought: "*Comme il m'aime! et comme il est bien!*" but was held back, partly through dread of making a *mésalliance*, partly because she felt bound and hampered by her own professions of undying sorrow, but most of all by the secret prompting of Madame Astier-Réchu, who, with consummate and patient hypocrisy, had established herself as the sympathizing friend and confidante of the mourning *princess*, and had then taken advantage of the situation to strike a bargain with a certain *prince d'Athis*, to put him in possession of the young widow and her millions in consideration of the sum of 200,000 francs, to be paid on delivery. Le Prince d'Athis, commonly known as "*Samy*" (meant, we presume, for "*Samunny*") has been for fifteen years the *amant attitré* of the Duchesse Padovani—another dear friend of Madame Astier's, about her own age, but still possessing, at fifty-three, considerable attractions. She comes of a great Corsican family, and is immensely rich; has for many years been separated from the duc, her husband—an Italian, much older than herself. She is doubtless a faulty woman, but has considerable greatness of character. She has made "*Samy*" all he is—endowed him with wealth, pushed him by her influence into the front rank of

diplomacy, guided his actions, and even prompted his words. For, in himself, he is a complete nullity—a mere cipher; his whole stock-in-trade consisting of a long black beard; “le chic Anglais” in dress and demeanour, including a contemptuous taciturnity which serves to cover his want of ideas; and a fixed stare which, it is rumoured, Bismarck has never been able to meet. It is true that some of the Prince’s friends offer a different explanation of the great Chancellor’s being obliged to turn away his face when the French diplomatist addresses him at too close quarters. Even Paul, who is certainly *pas tendre*, exclaims against the cruelty of his mother’s detaching “son Samy” from the *duchesse*; but he little knows who it is that is to take her place. With characteristic *truse* and secretiveness, the mother and son have unconsciously been countermining each other. It is a grimly pathetic situation, when the mother learns that by her machinations she has ruined the plans of her idolized son, which, if she had but known them, she would have given her soul to further. The *éclaircissement* takes place in a private box at the “Français.” “And how much are you to get?” asks Paul, cynically. She replies: “Two hundred thousand francs; we shall be rich.” “It costs me twenty millions,” he retorts. A personal appeal by Paul to the Princess might even yet retrieve matters; for her heart, such as it is, is on his side, and a certain tender interview in poor “Herbert’s” unfinished monument, of all places in the world, has given the enterprising young architect a hold over her. But, unluckily, Colette de Rosen has already, in compliance with the advice of her astute counsellor, left Paris for St. Petersburg, whither the Prince d’Athis is soon to follow, to present his credentials as French ambassador, and, shortly after, to marry Madame de Rosen. Still the “petit strugglingleur” does not despair. The Prince is still in Paris. He seeks him out and picks a quarrel with him, with the deliberate intention of killing him; fully relying on his own superiority in sword-play. The duel is admirably told. “Samy” is as inefficient as a duellist as in all the other relations of life. But chance, for once, sets at nought the law of “the survival of the fittest.” Paul—no one knows how—is severely wounded in the throat; within an ace of being killed; and “Samy,” to his surprise and delight, *en est quitte pour la peur*. But even under this unlooked-for mishap, Paul Astier does not lose sight of the main chance. Colette de Rosen is irrecoverably lost, so he determines to fall back on the forsaken Maria Antonia, Duchesse de Padovani. After a long syncope, he manages to scrawl the following words, which one of his seconds engages to deliver to her: “J’ai voulu vous venger, je n’ai pu.” Having thus laid his train, he submits himself to the doctor’s care with a quiet mind. And this last scheme is not destined to fail. The unhappy *duchesse*—more than twenty years his senior—has faith in the simulated love and devotion of the

base, cold-hearted, young fortune-hunter, and, with many misgivings and hesitations, promises to marry him. We take leave of them at the mairie. Paul is now "M. le comte,"—a papal title, we presume. Poor, proud, loving, "Mari Anto," already *désillusionnée*, looks so old and haggard that the adjoint says:—"Nous n'attendons plus que la mariée." "Elle est là, la mariée, répond la duchesse, s'avancant la tête haute."*

M. Daudet's romance deals with two subjects essentially distinct, though admirably blended by his skilful touch: one is the alleged worthlessness of the French *Académie*; the other, the hypocrisy and sordid corruption of Parisian society. It is with the latter, almost to the exclusion of the former, that we have concerned ourselves in the foregoing notice; following, with that intent, the fortunes of the son, Paul Astier, in preference to detailing the struggling squalid life and the tragic end of the father, Astier-Réhu, the hapless "Immortel" of the story. The reason of our choice is that the picture of the base depravity of Parisian high-life—bitter and caustic as it is—gives evidence of the calm impartiality and the unclouded insight of genius. It is worth analyzing and dwelling upon, for it may rank with such works as *Numa Roumestan* and *Les rois en Exil*. But the same praise cannot be extended to the attack on the *Académie*; it is marred by acrimony and *parti-pris*; the condemnation is too wholesale and indiscriminating. That M. Daudet's *Académie* bears a likeness to the real *Académie* is undeniable, but it is the likeness—not of a picture—but of a coarse caricature.

COUNT TOLSTOI'S LIFE AND WORKS.

IN an age when great imaginative writers are few and pessimistic, natures are inclined to despair of the Republic of Letters, the discovery that in the depths of Russia there lives, unsuspected, a man from whose pen, during the last thirty years, have proceeded works of the very highest quality, is surely an event of no small moment. Before the late Mr. Matthew Arnold's delicate shafts of irony had roused us from our satisfaction with things British and provincial, there would have been little to wonder at in any denseness of ignorance regarding Continental literature ; but now, when our generosity towards the unknown is such that we are only too prone to worship at the shrine of the latest French, Hindoo, or American oracle, it may well afford ground for surprise that so little attention has, until quite recently, been bestowed upon the illustrious subject of this article. A Gautier, a Baudelaire, a James or Howells, obtains not only the just praise that finished workmanship compels, but that generous tribute of enthusiasm which should be reserved for a Scott, a Hugo, and we make haste to add, a Tolstoi. Not for a moment would we grudge to any degree of merit its due reward. But we must protest alike against the popular estimate, which, to quote the folly of the moment, confounds Stevenson and Haggard as it confounded Tennyson and Montgomery ; and against the pseudo-scientific estimate which pretends to abolish rank in artistic achievement, which would sink the judge in the philosopher, and claim for the literary monarch and the literary insect the same respectful consideration.

Three years ago, which of us had heard of Count Leo Tolstoi ? A select circle there may have been to whom his name was familiar ; but it had not reached the ears of the profane crowd, it was *caviare* to the circulating library. Now he is read here by all who read French, and in cultivated America, we might almost say, by all who read anything ; for the States have been quicker than we to focus this Eastern light, and rival translations of his works are competing for sale in Boston as they compete in Paris. In this country, so far, the majority trust perforce to French versions ; but even here *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenine* are in an English garb becoming to conjure by, and, without excessive presumption, we may

anticipate a time when Count Tolstoi's other works will be enthroned on the shelves of Smith and Mudie.

Why this sudden recognition after well-nigh a generation of neglect? "Qui s'excuse s'accuse;" and we do not attempt to palliate an unpardonable sin of omission when we remind our Russian readers that Tolstoi has not, like his great and lamented compatriot Turgenieff, the good or evil fortune to write in Paris; and that, while Russian civilization is still for Western peoples a sealed book, an essential element in Tolstoi's greatness and the secret of his charm, now that it is discovered, to foreign readers, is his determined concentration on Russian subjects as judged by a Russian eye and treated from a Russian standpoint. Turgenieff acted as interpreter between East and West, he painted his countrymen for Europe; Tolstoi, the Rembrandt of his race, has painted them for themselves and, in the maturity of time, for humanity. This, his great merit, is also, we venture to think, one of the reasons why his fame has not spread more rapidly. Its recent expansion in France and America, and subsequently among ourselves, is more easily explicable. In the zenith of his powers he has deliberately turned his back upon the novel-writing which had made his reputation, has devoted himself to the advocacy of doctrines primitively Christian and profoundly, though quietly, socialistic, and, practising what he preaches, has excited among many sympathizers in many lands the interest that sincerity in high places never fails to evoke. His experiments in equality have been eagerly watched in the two great Republics, and whatever is known in France and America is not long unknown in Great Britain. From his present we have turned to his past. A series of tales, among which at least three must rank as masterpieces, at once explain the latest phase of his career and justify the respectful attention with which it has been followed.

Why should the countrymen of Richardson, Scott, and Dickens require to look so far afield for examples in fiction? It is difficult to account for the decline of our native novel. But that it has declined no one will deny. Search the best English novels of recent date, and where shall we find any noteworthy trace of that spiritual ascendancy, that dignified and lofty touch, which mark the work of a great age? The high style is all but extinct among us. We are amused, exhilarated, interested; never before were we so well supplied with the condiments of narrative; sketches of scenery and society, analyses of the scientific or the socialistic movement succeed each other with the brilliant and sterile monotony of a kaleidoscope. We expect little, and receive in proportion; we do not cry for the moon, and our modesty is rewarded with excellent green cheese!

The moon still shines, nevertheless, for those who can see over their chimneys. With what a sigh of relief do we turn from the trite and narrow commonplace that ekes out our sentimental trilogies

to works of a more heroic fibre, whose interests are the real interests of life and death, whose aspirations are of the heavens heavenly, whose conclusions are the pure grain from the garner of experience, sifted by a tried and trusty hand! With what zest we devour, with what regret we abandon a book, in whose pages we have time after time enjoyed that keenest pleasure of the mind—the indescribable thrill of delight and astonishment that salutes a stroke of supreme and invisible art, placing us in touch with Nature! And if, over and above its elevation and its truth, the book sets before us, in such vivid outlines as an instinctive feeling tells us must correspond to the reality, whole groups of typical figures, illustrating a national character, hitherto unconceived, in its infinite variety of manner, thought and action, shall we not hasten to acknowledge that here is one of the great masters, before whom ordinary merit must be dumb, whom to criticize is vain, to admire alone is permitted? Imagine the union of all these qualities and you shall understand the supremacy which Scott achieved over the Europe of our grandfathers, and that which Tolstoi is winning over the Europe of to-day.

There are many reasons for the growing interest with which contemporary Russian literature is regarded in the West. The tide of ideas which has, during the last fifty years, been slowly but persistently advancing, till under the formidable titles of Socialism, Communism, and Nihilism, it promises to invade the whole dominion of politics, art, and literature, has nowhere made such threatening strides, and nowhere encountered such a sullen resistance, as in the Empire of the Czars. For the moment, Russia takes the position which England held in the seventeenth and France in the eighteenth century; the *perfidum ingenium*, the reckless ardour for new ideas, political and social, has migrated from the lands of Knox, of Milton, and of Robespierre to another and a sterner climate. The Russians now, as formerly, live under a government which it is the sober truth to style an "absolute monarchy tempered by assassination." Their civilization has not yet assumed the complex developments which in more mature social types disguise simple issues and lengthen the process of disintegration and renewal. Except in a few black oases they have not emerged from the agricultural into the modern industrial stage. Their classes are more broadly distinguished than ours, and between each there is a deeper gulf. The strength of their caste feeling is shown by the recent ukase, excluding from the higher grades of the civil service and the army all officers without the stamp of nobility. That such an edict should not merely be issued but enforced enables us to realize what, after all, the Russians make sufficiently plain when they contrast French, Germans, English and Italians with themselves under the generic name of "Europeans." Like their church, their civilization is

peculiar to themselves and alien to that with which we are acquainted. On this alien civilization the ideas of the West, seconded not only by all their own material and immediately transferable resources, but also by the mobile temperament of their new recipients, have during two generations been acting with a strangely solvent force. Ardently welcomed, but conceived with the inevitable shallowness of the precocious imitator, they have produced in Russia results of which their original propagators did not even dream, and the recent imaginative literature of the country has been little more than a study (but what a study!) of the process of interfusion and the violent separation, or gradual assimilation, of the various contending elements. In dramatic interest what could surpass the personal history of the last four Czars? The ardent Alexander I., of Triple Alliance fame—an incarnation of excellent intention, moral enthusiasm, and feeble performance, dying while his hopes were yet unfulfilled, but not before disillusion had begun to arrive; the stronger Nicholas, inheriting with his brother's crown an ambition destined to be trampled in the mire of the Crimean; Alexander II, the liberator, expiating in his own body sins for which he was no more personally responsible than for the general order of Nature; his successor, the latest apostle of absolute rule, a prisoner in a splendid cage: what a spectacle of Fate is here! In such a chronicle there lurk, unseen but ever tremulous beneath the surface, the moving elements of terror and pity: and the remoteness of the country, the mystery that still shrouds it from the Western eye, the fitful glamour that illuminates its Court, all suggest a comparison with the circumstances which enabled Æschylus in the *Persæ*—sole exception among extant Greek dramas—to draw from contemporary history the materials of a noble tragedy.

The Nemesis, whose working may be read in the reverses of the Imperial House, is equally manifest on a grander scale in the recent internal history of Russia. We have all been astonished, times without number, by the desperate self-sacrifice, the stoical indifference to consequences, the all but idiotic obstinacy in an apparently hopeless cause, displayed by one after another of the group of Nihilistic conspirators—the overt representatives of a repressed, but none the less constant, movement of national thought and feeling. It is easy for common sense to point out their extravagances: common sense never moved mountains. But an impartial review of their attempts will hardly fail to result in the conviction, so powerfully brought home to the reader of Turgeneff's *Virgin Soil*, that they do not realize the nature of their task. Before they can attain the liberty for which, in the extreme form corresponding to the existing extreme of despotism, they would fain be thought contending, they have an immense duty to perform. They should learn from Mazzini. So long as they are content to "simplify" themselves by descending

the level of the peasants on whom they must ultimately rely, whose apotheosis is an article in their creed, without attempting the correlative process of raising the peasants from the ignorance and apathy which are their present characteristics, their efforts are premature and are doomed to fail. Caught between the wheels of a powerful administration and the suspicious indifference of the class from whose enfranchisement so many of their number dated the millennium, they serve but to point the moral of the nineteenth century—that adaptation, correlation, evolution, are laws which Nature enforces in the social as in all other spheres, and that, hurry Nature as you will, she does not move the quicker. In Russia, as we have said, the working of this law can be verified with greater ease than in our more complex societies, and the superior spirits among her writers have acknowledged the truth, and described with an unshrinking, albeit a tender and pitiful touch, the hopeless struggle between man and Nature: the former applying an imperfect diagnosis and acting upon a faulty generalization, the latter turning her surgeon's feeble hand in silent mockery against his own bosom, and finally crushing him beneath the irresistible weight of facts. In reading Turgenieff we realize the meaning of the contest, and watch, as from the heights of Salamis, the scene in the waters below; passing to Tolstoi, we are already in *“в мѣстѣ”*, we bend beneath the blows of fate, we stagger, fall, and for a moment despair. Yet our very desperation renews our strength. Our cause, we feel, is just; it is our faith that is waning. How to confirm our faith? This is the note to which Tolstoi's work is strung from first to last, and the echo in which he hears an answer has no novel sound; it has burst from many a Christian lip, but has never, perhaps, been more nobly interpreted than by Diderot when he said: “Faites le bien, et songez que la nécessité des événements est égale sur tous.”

This determination to look straight at the facts of life, whether national, political, or social, to shirk none of its enigmas, to explain it where he can, and where he cannot to reflect its glittering facets in their cold and hard reality, is at the root of Tolstoi's strength, as it was at the root of Goethe's. We have attempted to indicate some of the phenomena which, beyond doubt, influence his interpretation. In Russia, more than in any Western State, the rendering of life, sometimes called fatalism, but which we should prefer to term resignation, appears natural and right; and Tolstoi is here at one with the mass of his countrymen. His realism, unlike that of a declining French school, is not the realism of the gutter. From the gutter, indeed, he does not recoil, but in it he sees the image of the sky. It is alleged that he photographs instead of painting; that he presents his readers with a slice of actual life instead of an artistic selection. The analogy is false. No literary production can be rightly compared to a photograph. Facts which have once passed through the

mechanism of the human brain are recreated, not reproduced, and this "recreation" is the function of art. There is need for a modicum of art in an auctioneer's list, for more in a newspaper paragraph; but in a novel, in a lengthy criticism of life, for what an infinitude! From the facts that crowd upon the novelist a selection must perforce be made, and on his faculty of choice, no less than on his faculties of representation and imagination, depends his greatness. Let him but have a grotesque, a distorted, a perverted view of the relative importance of things and of men—his choice will be at fault, and no talent of invention, no vividness of portraiture, will give him a claim to supreme rank. Tolstoi, in common with Zola, possesses the qualities last named. But in the sphere of artistic choice Tolstoi's superiority is simply transcendent.

There are few exceptions to the rule that an author's books are his best biography. A short sketch of the external facts of Count Leo Tolstoi's life may, however, be of a certain use and interest. His family, originally ennobled by Peter the Great in the person of a famous and capable Minister, has during the last two hundred years been eminent in Russia. In war, art, literature, or the civil service, at least five Counts Tolstoi have distinguished themselves during this century. The subject of the present sketch was born in 1828, three years after the accession of Nicholas. Early left an orphan, he spent his childhood on his mother's estate, until, at the age of fifteen, he was entered at the Military School of Kazan. About 1851 he went as an artillery officer to the Caucasus. Between that date and the outbreak of the Crimean War he wrote his first books—*Recollections of Infancy, Childhood and Youth*, and *The Cossacks*. At the siege of Sebastopol he commanded a battery, an experience of which he rendered account in the sketches called *Sebastopol in December, 1855, and in May and August, 1856*, and on which he has drawn for many vivid pages in his subsequent writings. He then for a time enjoyed the ordinary life of a Russian noble, as we can picture it after reading *Anna Karenine*. Upon the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, he returned from a tour in Western Europe, and for a year remained on his estate, fulfilling the duties of a magistrate, and trying to educate the new freemen. This proved an irksome task, and he left it to visit Siberia. In 1862 or 1863 he made a happy marriage. Since then he has for the most part lived a quiet country life. The fifteen years that followed his marriage were spent in constant literary activity. *Two Generations, Katia, The Story of a Horse, The Prisoner of the Caucasus, The Death of Ivan Ilitch and Polikouchka*, appear to belong to this, his most productive period; but it is chiefly marked by the composition of his two longest and greatest creations—*War and Peace* (1869) and *Anna Karenine* (1877).

In 1879, as the author tells us in his *Confessions*, a complete revolution began to take place in his mode of envisaging life. It is

impossible within our limits to describe the process of this conversion, the most interesting, perhaps, that has been recounted since the date of *Sartor Resartus*. We can only say that Tolstoi assumed and retains a position in regard to religion and society which, with many divergences on points of detail, is in its general features more analogous to that of the early Quakers than to any other with which we are acquainted. He renounced novel-writing, though in the series of short tales illustrating the parables of the New Testament, published to inculcate his view of Christ's Christianity among the peasantry, and circulating perhaps more widely than all his former works put together, we can still trace the hand of the master. Part of his day is devoted to manual labour in the fields, or at the trade of George Fox, part to the preparation of a Commentary on the Gospels. His object is nothing less than the moral and mental regeneration of his countrymen: of the rich through a more ardent and better directed sympathy with the poor; of rich and poor alike through a more literal interpretation of the precepts of Christ. He has explained some of the causes that led him to his new convictions in his *Confessions* mentioned above. The economic starting-point of his present opinions is stated in his volume, *What is to be Done?* its religious aspect in *What I Believe*; and in the strange drama entitled *The Powers of Darkness*, he endeavours to paint for the peasants whom he loves, admires, and would fain elevate, the triumph of the undying principles of religion and morality in a nature which seemed for ever lost, so far was it sunk beneath the passions of lust, avarice, and selfish enjoyment.

A man who, at the age of fifty, can renounce all that has made him great in pursuit of the ideal, is evidently one whose biography is worth attentive consideration. Particularly remarkable is such an event in the life of a Russian; for, if one point is more impressive than another in the history of recent Russian movements, it is the extreme youth of those who, at least in action, have led the van. Count Tolstoi's own novels, not to mention Turgeneff's, afford many instances of the rule that, among his countrymen, character is made and habit set by forty, and that after maturity is once attained we need not look for further changes. Proportionate to the mobility of the Russian youth is, in most cases, the fixity of his subsequent opinions. But a connected study of Tolstoi's works soon reveals the secret that his latest phase is but a stage of development to which all the others have been preparatory. From *The Cossacks* to *Anna Karenine*, we can trace an alternate process of self-questioning, temporary reconciliation, and subsequent dissatisfaction resulting in new effort. We are inclined to believe that Tolstoi has a reserve stock of surprises, and that some day we shall hear of one more step in advance.

This growth of the soul, as it is the key to Tolstoi's life, so it is the great interest of his books. Each of his works is a psychological

study; and but for his marvellous gift of adapting action to character, or rather of displaying character as it is displayed in life, by action; but for the infinite variety which his invention lends to the situations he describes, we should be compelled to allow that the psychological interest dwarfs the other elements in his romances. Listen to an account of stages of child-life—the child, under a thin veil, being easily recognizable as Tolstoi himself. First, we see the mere infant, tired of playing; he has fallen asleep in the drawing-room, and his mother rouses him:—

“‘Get up, my darling, it is your bed-time.’ Her arm embraced me, her fingers moved and gently tickled my neck. The room was quiet and only half lighted. My nerves were overstrung. Mamma was close by my side; I smelt her perfumes, I heard her voice. Forced to get up, I wound my arms round her neck, laid my head on her bosom, and said, sleepy as I was: ‘Ah! dear, dear mamma, how I love you!’”

A few years, and the infant's little range begins to widen:—

“For the first time I felt clearly that we were not all the world, that our family was not the only one, that all interests did not turn on ours; that, in short, there were other families, other men, who had nothing in common with us, took no trouble about us, and did not even know of our existence.”

His childish miseries, so dark, so comical, are relieved by childish dreams. His French tutor, Saint-Jerome, has shut him into the black hole of punishment:—

“I fancy myself at liberty, out of the house. I enlist in the Hussars, I go to the wars. From behind, on all sides, the enemy attacks me. My sabre flashes—to right—to left: one, two, three of my assailants are cut down. At last, overwhelmed by wounds and fatigue, I fall with a shout of ‘Victory!’ The general draws near, and asks, ‘Who is our deliverer?’ They point me out. He falls on my neck and in turn shouts ‘Victory!’ with tears of joy. I become convalescent . . . Soon I am made general. The Emperor meets me and asks, ‘Who is this young man covered with scars?’ He is informed it is the famous hero Nicholas. And the Emperor says, ‘I thank you. Speak: I will grant whatever you request.’ I bow respectfully, lean on my sword and reply, ‘I am happy, great Emperor, to have shed my blood for my country. My only desire is to die for it. But since I am permitted to make a request, allow me to annihilate my special enemy, the foreigner, Saint-Jerome!’”

We follow him in the formation of his first friendships—his characteristic quality of candour exercising a strong attraction over a certain class of minds. The delightful *camaraderie*, so foreign in many of its manifestations to our ideas, which is a marked feature in continental student life, is charmingly described by both Turgenieff and Tolstoi, but never better than in the narration of Nicholas' first introduction to the university. An exquisite sense of the humorous side of initiation into knowledge of the world of men and women characterizes all the later sketches contained in the *Recollections*. What could be finer than this picture of the unpremeditated

falsehoods into which the shy, nervous, excitable young *débutant* is surprised? He has just obtained his student's uniform, and feels bound to maintain its dignity :—

"The Prince Ivan Ivanovitch, I said, was one of my nearest relations; I had dined that day at his house; he had even invited me to spend the entire summer with him, but I had refused, since I already knew his home by heart: I had often been there, and was no longer interested in all its fine gates and bridges, for I never could endure luxury, particularly in the country. In the country, I thought, everything should be countrified. After launching this long and complex falsehood, I blushed so deeply that every one at once saw that I had lied. Varegnka and Sophia turned away, and changed the conversation, with an expression which I have often since noticed on the faces of kindly people when a young man begins to lie with assurance—an expression which may be thus translated: 'We know quite well he is fibbing; why should he fib so, poor boy!'"

"It is as true as it is inexplicable," says Turgenieff, "that the Russians are the most inveterate liars in the universe; and yet they love and esteem nothing so much as the truth." This national quality is one which Tolstoi takes a particular delight in exhibiting in action. His young heroes open their lips to speak the truth, and in its very utterance the truth they meant to tell is transformed into fiction.

Nicholas, of course, falls in love once, twice, and thrice, and is only sorry, as each new flame devours the others, that not more than one can burn at the same moment. But we must not linger any longer over this charming book, so instructive in its revelations of the author's character and method. Before leaving it let us merely invite the reader's attention to the chapter called "*Comme il faut*," in which he will find an account of the estimate of life which the title implies, and to the subsequent chapter "*A New Comrade*," in which that estimate, hitherto blindly accepted, is for the first time shaken in Nicholas's young mind. Coming events cast their shadows before.

In one respect Tolstoi has never excelled *The Cossacks*, a book which made an epoch in Russian literature: even now it remains his artistic *chef d'œuvre*. The piece is very short. It describes the visit of Olenine, a young Russian officer of noble birth, sick of clubs and life about town, to the virgin country of the Cossacks. There he falls in love with Marianna, the daughter of the peasant farmer in whose house he is quartered—an exquisite creation, recalling the Mireio of the Provençal poet, Mistral. The gradual growth of his passion, his attempts to master it, his friendship with the old hunter Jerockha, his determination to marry the girl, her apparent consent, the careless contempt of his Cossack rival Lucas, and the *dénouement*, showing the unreality of the whole affair and the impassable gulf between the wild creature and the tame—all are touched and told with the grace of inimitable art.

"Men," thought Olenine, "live here according to the laws of Nature; they are born, beget children, fight, eat, drink, enjoy life, die, and know no laws other than those imposed by Nature on the planets, on vegetation, and on animals alike. Those men seemed to him better, more energetic, more independent than himself: comparing himself with them he was seized with shame and pity. An idea struck him: he would break entirely with his past, buy a hut and cattle, marry a Cossack girl—not Marianna, her he would leave to Lucas—and live with Jerochka, hunting, fishing, and taking part in the Cossack expeditions. 'Why hesitate? why wait?' he asked himself. He was ashamed to stand in need of prompting. Why fear to do what was just and reasonable? What sin could there be in becoming Cossack pure and simple, in living according to Nature, harming none—nay, doing good? What an advance upon his old ambition for an official or military grade! Yet a hidden voice bade him halt. He felt confusedly that he would not be content with Jerochka's or Lucas' life, that there was another sort of happiness called devotion and self-sacrifice. . . . He changed his mind, clung anew to the idea of renouncement, and again looked down with a placid pride upon men and their enjoyments."

That is the first struggle. Here is the final decision:—

"Self sacrifice! What folly! It is mere pride, a desire to escape the sufferings that I deserve, the jealousy that another's happiness inspires in me. Why live for my neighbour, why spend my life in doing good, when I only love myself, and myself have but one desire, to love her, Marianna, and to live in her existence. . . . I am carried on by an irresistible force. I suffer, but I exist: formerly I was dead. . . . This very day I will go and tell her all!"

There is the civilized man. Now listen to the Cossacks—Lucas to Marianna:—

"'Why always wait and wait? Don't I love you enough? Make of me what you will,' said he, in a transport of passion, seizing the girl's two hands.

"Marianna's face did not change; she remained calm. 'Don't talk nonsense, Loukachka, but listen to me,' she said, without withdrawing her hands, but holding the Cossack at his distance. 'I am only a girl, but you ought to listen to me. I am not my own mistress; if you love me, listen to me. Let my hands go; I have something to tell you. I will marry you—yes; but meanwhile let your follies be for others.'

"'You will marry me; yes, they will settle that without us—but love me, Marianouchka,' said Lucas, sweetly and humbly, all his anger gone—and he eyed the girl with a tender smile.

"Marianna threw herself upon him, and kissed him on the lips. 'Darling!' she murmured, with a convulsive embrace. Then she tore herself from his arms, ran away without looking behind her, and re-entered the courtyard."

In *The Cossacks* we see definitely Tolstoi's determination, from which he has never swerved, to present life as it is, to have done with romantic flights, and to picture the truth in all its alternations of happiness and misery; to admit, indeed, the ideal, without which no true representation of life is possible, because without it we cannot live; but not to disguise the limitations which hamper its quest and

the sad necessities that chain us to reality. If one of the chief elements in humour is precisely this grasp of the contrast between effort and performance, and if those are the greatest humorists who, seeing the fatal absurdity of life, retain their sane and healthy view of its value and importance, there are few humorists to compare with Tolstoi. "C'est une faute commune," says Vauvenargue, in his dry but trenchant manner; "lorsque on fait un plan, on songe aux choses sans songer à soi." Tolstoi's works may in one aspect be called a commentary on this text, often amusing, not to say rollicking, in its play of fun and fancy; often pathetic, leaning, as a rule, to mercy's part, and never cruel even when pitilessly just to the poor Alnaschar side of human nature.

We must pass rapidly over the intermediate tales before approaching the greatest of all. The pictures of *Sebastopol during the Siege* have an extraordinary vividness, and should be particularly interesting to British readers. Never, perhaps, were the horrors of modern war so graphically illustrated, unless it be in the paintings of Tolstoi's countryman, the artist Verestchagin. As the author says: "The hero of my narrative, whom I love with all the force of my soul, whom I have tried to represent in all his beauty, who has been, is, and ever shall be beautiful—my hero is the Truth." We have read few more pathetic scenes than those with which the third sketch, *Sebastopol in August 1855*, draws to a close, describing the deaths of the two brothers whose fortunes during the siege the preceding pages have recounted.

Death, indeed, exercises a strange, if not a morbid fascination, over the more sombre side of Tolstoi's genius. He takes a grim pleasure in bringing his heroes face to face with the inevitable spectre. Already in childhood his *alter ego*, Nicholas, has confronted it. "Reflecting that death awaits us at each hour, at each minute, I told myself that man can only be happy if he profits by the present without dreaming of the future, and I could not understand how others had failed to comprehend this simple truth." To Olenine, in *The Cossacks*, the thought comes in a moment of imagined peril: "He was seized with panic; he feared, and began to pray. Above all, he dreaded death before fulfilling any useful work; he ardently desired to live, and to live in order to perform some great act of self-sacrifice." The boy officer, in *Sebastopol*, every inch a soldier, has a similar experience: "Sleep fled from his eyes; but suddenly the thought of an omnipotent God, who sees all and who hears each prayer, welled up clear and distinct in the midst of his reveries; he fell on his knees, crossed himself, and joined his hands as he had been taught in childhood. This simple gesture gave birth to a sentiment of infinite sweetness, long forgotten." We may say without exaggeration that the Angel of Death hovers over the whole of this weird

description of the most prolonged and terrible struggle of modern warfare. Other sketches avowedly centre round the same dread topic. *The Death of Ivan Iliitch* is a painful account of a last illness; the agony of the sufferer, the helplessness of his relations, the gulf between hope and despair, even wider than that which severs life from death; and the final relief when all is over, are painted with a truth that would be cruel but for the moral that shines from the whole—the emptiness of a selfish life. Elsewhere the contrast is drawn in the description of a peasant's death—not greeted with either joy or despair, but calmly met as the inevitable close of a strenuous career alike by the dying man and by his friends.

Katia and *Polikouchka* are equally remarkable for their adherence to a prosaic, and, in the latter case, a painful reality. The moody, silent orphan Katia, brought up by her governess in a country-house, where the monotony is broken only by the occasional visit of her guardian, her dead father's friend; the sudden awakening from isolation into a romantic love, inspired and secretly returned by this guardian himself; their engagement and marriage; their episode of ideal happiness, followed by a period of comparative estrangement, and the final transformation of their old love, long since dead, into a perhaps sounder, certainly a less ethereal affection: each chapter is told with the power of Charlotte Brontë, but how different the conclusions from those of *Jane Eyre*! *Polikouchka*, the later story, is one of Tolstoi's peasant studies—a village tragedy whose lesson, as we read it, is the danger of foolish favouritism, and the penalties it may entail, not merely on the favourite, but on his house and friends.

We now reach the work in which Tolstoi's genius has perhaps reached its highest elevation, though its flight is less sustained than in *Anna Karenine*—the curious combination of novel and history called *War and Peace*. It must be acknowledged that this book has the fault of excessive length. It recalls the Richardsonian epic rather than the terse and nimble-footed tales which content the modest ambitions of the nineteenth-century reader. The background of the group of stories that are here combined is the Russia of the Napoleonic age. It is difficult for a foreigner to imagine any phase of the national life during that epoch which is left untouched. The Court and the camp, town and country, nobles and peasants—all are sketched in with the same broad and sure outline. We pass at a leap from a *soirée* to a battlefield, from a mud hovel to a palace, from idyll to Saturnalia. As we summon our recollections of this prodigal outpouring of a careless genius, a troop of characters as lifelike as any in Scott or in Shakespeare defile before our mental eye. The Rostoy family, surely the most lovable in modern fiction, appears and disappears, and returns anew as the charming children whom we see when the curtain rises attain

youth and enter the great world, the boys to fight, and one of them, alas! to die; the girls to spell the old story of love given and taken, stolen and renounced, in its changing tones of joy, sadness, and despair. We salute the old Count, expensive even in his economies; the Countess, a very pattern of motherhood; the unsympathetic sister Vera, whose marriage with Berg, the careful German, the family frankly accepts as a relief; Nicholas, the hero in spite of himself, whose simple patriotism and bravery are as admirable as his unconscious braggadocio is absurd; the gentle Sonia, the daughter of the Countess' *protégée*, and Nicholas' first love; Petia, the little brother, who all but runs away to the war that takes his life, and with it all the sunshine from his mother's; and last, but most entrancing of all, the girl whose character is Tolstoi's highest achievement, and, we venture to say, one of the glories of literature, Natacha. To her we shall return. Against this family another is set as a foil, that of the old prince, Bolkonsky, a fretful martinet, venomous in proportion to his affection. Bolkonsky's son, Prince Andrew, and another typically Russian figure, Count Peter Besoukhov, are with Nicholas the chief heroes of the book. The study of Prince Andrew is one of those psychological histories in which Tolstoi excels. Married young to a woman whom he loves, but who is incapable of understanding his deep and powerful nature, he leaves her to join his regiment, returns to find himself alone with a motherless infant, and for a time seeks consolation in war and politics. Just as he thinks he has attained peace, fate brings Natacha across his path, and in his love for this young girl, at first repressed, then rising in an irresistible tide of mature passion; in the new vista of life and happiness which it discloses; in the realization of his hopes of winning her love, the subsequent separation for a year at his father's desire, and the life's tragedy to which it leads, Tolstoi finds endless opportunities of inculcating his favourite themes—the mastery of circumstance over will and desire, the weakness of man in the front of things, and the necessity of resignation.

A kindred moral is drawn from the history of Peter Besoukhov. After a youth, in which riot and aspiration are curiously blent, this ungainly inheritor of enormous wealth is dragooned into a marriage with a woman of fascinating personal attractions, but totally devoid of soul, and at heart as indifferent to him as he is to her. Such a union bears its natural fruits. Peter separates from his wife, and, like his friend Prince Andrew, seeks abroad and in society the happiness he cannot look for at home. Weary of excess, he finds a temporary moral stimulus in Freemasonry, and, when this likewise turns out to be vanity, casts himself in a frenzy of despair between the armies of Napoleon and the Czar. He sees as a spectator the battle of Borodino and the burning of Moscow, shares as a prisoner the terrible

retreat of the Grand Army, and eventually returns home unscathed in body and purified in soul by the fiery ordeal through which he has passed. In the lesson of faith and courage which he learns from the simple peasant, who is one of the comrades of his privations, and whose death, just before the other prisoners are rescued, is one of the most pathetic incidents of the book, we again see the theory of "simplification" at work. Its place in modern Russian thought and life has indeed been justly compared with that taken by the "return to nature" in the French movements of the last century.

Before continuing the history of Prince Andrew, we must revert to Natacha. Let us introduce her. The scene is in a drawing-room.

"All of a sudden a noise was heard as though several people were rushing across the adjoining room, a chair was knocked over, and a little girl of thirteen, holding up in one hand the skirt of her muslin robe, in which something was hidden, ran into the very centre of the drawing-room, and there came to a sudden halt. It was clear that a frantic rush had carried her further than she intended. . . . The little girl, with her black eyes and her large mouth, seemed rather plain than pretty, but to counterbalance this her vivacity was extraordinary. The movements of her shoulders, still panting in the loose corsage, showed she had been running; black ringlets, all in disorder, fell over her back: her bare arms were slim and slender; lace trimmings still appeared beneath her frock, and the little feet were in shoes. In a word, she was at that age, fraught with expectation, when the girl is no more a child but not yet a woman. Escaping from her father's arms, she flung herself on her mother without paying the slightest heed to her rebuke, and, hiding her fiery face in the lace that covered the Countess' mantle, broke into an uncontrollable burst of laughter and began in gasps to tell some story about the doll which she produced from her skirt."

This passionate little mortal develops into a lovely girl with a voice of unusual compass and expression. Her brother Nicholas comes home one evening in a mood of utter despair, disgusted with the world and with himself, because, yielding to a momentary temptation, he has lost far more over cards than his father, as he knows, can well afford to pay. Natacha begins to sing, in her sweet tones, half child's, half woman's.

"'What can it be?' thought Nicholas, hearing her sing thus, and opening astonished eyes, 'What can it be, what has happened to her? How she sings!' Forgetting everything, he waited with a feverish impatience for the next note, and for one moment his universe lay in the triple time of the "O mio crudele affetto." 'How absurd,' he thought, 'is our existence! Misfortune, money, hatred, honour—all that is less than nothing; here is the real, the true. My darling Natacha! Let us see whether she will reach the "si." She has reached it, hurrah!' And to strengthen the 'si' he accompanied it in the third. 'What happiness,' he cried, 'I have taken it too!' and the vibration of this third awoke the best and purest feelings of his soul. Compared with this divine sensation, what trifles were his losses at cards, his promise to pay!"

Prince Andrew visits the Bostovs. Unable to sleep, he opens his

window and enjoys the fresh night air of summer. Suddenly, from the floor above, he hears the sound of women's voices. It is Natacha and Sonia.

"'Once more, only once,' said one of the voices, which Prince Andrew immediately recognized.

"'But when *will* you go to sleep, Natacha?' replied the other.

"'If I cannot sleep it is no fault of mine . . . once more.' . . . And the two voices murmured together the refrain of a romance.

"'How beautiful it is! Now let us sleep.'

"'Sleep if you can; I cannot.'

The Prince could hear the light rustling of the speaker's gown, and even her breathing, for she must have been leaning over the window sill. All was silent and peaceful: the shadows and lights cast by the moon appeared strong in their stillness. Prince Andrew feared by any movement to betray his involuntary presence.

"'Sonia, Sonia,' resumed the first voice, 'how can you sleep? Look, look, how lovely, how beautiful! Wake up,' and she added, with emotion, 'There never was a night so ravishing, never, never!' Sonia's voice murmured a reply. 'Oh! come, look at the moon, my darling, my sweet, my only pet; do come! Stand on tiptoe; put your knees together; there is room for two if you press close together, you see, so! Be careful, you will fall.' Then there was something like a struggle, and Sonia's discontented voice began again: 'Do you know it is nearly two o'clock!'

"'Oh! you are spoiling all my pleasure; go away, go away.'

"The silence recommenced, but Prince Andrew felt by her light movements and her sighs that she was still there.

"'How wonderful, wonderful!' she exclaimed suddenly. 'To bed, then, since I must.' And she closed the casement with a rattle."

We have not space to tell all the sequel. Suffice it to say that the impetuous, undisciplined girl, during the prolonged absence of her true lover, Prince Andrew, falls under the influence of the heartless and fascinating brother of Peter Besoukhov's fascinating wife. The episode is similar to that of Kitty and Wronsky in *Anna Karenine*; but the effects on Natacha's character are life-long. An elopement is planned, and, happily, frustrated. The poor girl wakes from her dream, realizes that she has been the dupe of a scoundrel, and, in an agony of shame and self-contempt, learns for the first time that to live in the present moment is not enough—that principle is no less necessary than emotion. Her moral nature gradually recovers its balance, and when Prince Andrew, mortally wounded, again by a strange coincidence comes within her reach, she is ready to nurse him through his last sufferings with a transfigured devotion which at once comprehends and excludes the unchastened passion of her early love. She receives her reward, as the following passage, the last that we can quote, will show:

"Prince Andrew lost consciousness. When he came back to himself Natacha, the real Natacha, she, whom of all beings he longed to love with that pure and divine affection which had just been revealed to him, Natacha was there, on her knees, in front of him. He realized her presence so clearly, that he experienced no surprise, but merely an ineffable sensation of happiness. Natacha, terrified, dared not stir; she tried to stifle

her sobs, and a slight tremor passed over her pale face. Prince Andrew heaved a sigh of relief, smiled, and offered her his hand. 'You!' he said. 'What happiness!' Natacha pressed close beside him, gently took his hand and kissed it, though her lips hardly touched it. 'Forgive me,' she murmured, raising her head; 'forgive me!' 'I love you!' said he. 'Forgive me!' 'What have I to forgive?' 'Forgive what I have done,' said Natacha, very low and with a painful effort. 'I love you more than ever,' replied Prince Andrew, taking her head to look into her eyes, which timidly gazed at his through tears of joy, and blazed with love and pity."

We shall not indicate the closing scenes of the book, serene, like those of most great novels, in their acceptance of average workaday life as the natural lot of man. Nor do we propose to do more than mention Tolstoi's last novel, *Anna Karenine*. It is better known in this country than his earlier works, and has had the unique advantage of recent analysis by the pen of the lamented chief of English criticism. If the present sketch of the greatest of living novelists should add one or two more to the number of Tolstoi's admirers, its intention will be amply realized.

CHINA: A NEW DEPARTURE.

If there is one feature in Chinese polity that has been admired in Europe with unqualified approval, it is the public examinations through which every Chinese must pass if he would enter official life or would obtain a degree giving him the cachet of an educated gentleman. Nor can anything seem more excellent, in theory, than a system which sends the elect of districts to compete in the capital of the Province, and the elect of provinces to compete in the capital of the Empire, for the literary honours which promise them a career, and which assure to the State a choice of educated servants. The sentiment on which this competitive system is founded is that only "the wise and able should rule," and it would seem difficult to devise a better method of bringing the wise and able to the fore. "The first effect of the system," writes a sinologue¹ than whom few are more familiar with Chinese customs, "is the establishment of schools in every village, town, and city—two, three, or twenty, in proportion to the population. The next effect is the drafting of the brighter boys to the list of candidates for degrees. The third effect is the sifting of those candidates; and the test is threefold; not merely scholarship, but excellence in letters combined with good moral character and good blood: for every aspirant requires to show a pedigree unsoiled through three generations, and also that his forbears do not belong to any of the tabooed classes, such as play-actors, barbers, and executioners." These precautions apart, the examinations fulfil the great boast of democracy, by providing an opening for talent in every grade of society, and have acted as a stimulus to education during at least thirteen centuries.

Supposing everything as regards the genealogical tree and the personal reputation of the candidates is satisfactory, "they begin their student's course by going up twice every three years to be examined in the chief city of their district, also twice in three years to the chief city of their department." These examinations, however, are merely initiatory and confer no degree. The real trial of strength begins when the official examiner for the entire province visits the prefectural city. "The number which assembles at these examinations differs largely in different provinces, ranging from 3000 up to

¹ *The Literati of China, and How to Meet them.* By the Rev. A. Williamson, LL.D.

12,000." The proportion of places or degrees obtainable likewise varies from, say, 1 in 40 or 50 to 1 in 80 or 100.

"Those who gain this degree (called *Siu-tsai*, or 'Budding Talent'), assemble again once every three years at the capital of the province, to compete for the second or *Kui-jen* degree (equal to our M.A.). Here the chances are still fewer. About 8000 or 10,000 present themselves, but only 64 (in *Shantung*, *e.g.*) can 'leap the dragon gate,' as it is called, and enter the arena for future competition. . . . These *Kui-jen* examinations are held simultaneously at the capital of each province; and the proud victors proceed to Peking in the following spring, to contend for the third degree, called the *Tsin-shi* (= LL.D.), which means 'fit for office.' In this third intellectual tournament the competitor enters the list with similarly picked men from all the provinces of China. The number varies from 8000 to 10,000, and there are from 200 to 400 places. . . . The prize-men in this contest again assemble for a final bout before the Emperor himself, who eliminates eighteen or so [called *Hanlin*], and from these selects . . . first, second, and third wranglers. . . . These are feasted by the Emperor, their names are carried by expresses throughout the whole country, and for the time being they are the heroes of the empire. And they deserve to be so; for observe, they are not the wranglers of one university only but of the whole nation, and not a small nation, but one equal to Europe, and not annuals, but the choicest outcome of three years; so that they stand as if they were victors in a contest in which all the high-degree men and prize-men in every nation in Europe assembled triennially to compete for supremacy."

Surely, concludes Dr. Williamson, those who could carry off the laurels in such a contest must be of high intellectual power and of rare attainments. And so in fact they are; but, as is too often the case in China, the practical effect of the system is less perfect than the theoretical conception—for this reason: the standard of excellence is acquaintance with the classical writers of antiquity! and it is this perpetual striving after an antique instead of a progressive standard that has helped to petrify the Chinese civilization. The amount of study required is immense, but the range of subjects through which the candidates have to pass is immeasurably inferior to those set before our own students. It is some oracular and often recondite saying of Confucius which is usually given as a theme, and the familiarity shown by a candidate with the lore of the ancients will go farther than modern knowledge, or originality in his own reflections, to commend his essay to the Examiners. It is needless to emphasise the stereotyping effect of this system on the national mind. By ever striving after a fixed and antique model, every generation came to resemble its predecessor. A high standard of culture was reached, but it was culture of a unique kind, in which the inventive faculties lay comparatively dormant while the mnemonic were abnormally developed; where archaic was preferred to progressive thought, and literary style became a prominent instead of an incidental test of merit. The conservatism of the Chinese has been a subject of remark, wonder, and some contempt among Western nations; but it has perhaps been less generally understood, that it is to these exam-

inations the fixity is greatly due. English people themselves are far more exclusive than they suspect; far too prone to reject fresh ideas and ridicule strange notions, for the simple reason that they are strange—different, that is, from the habits of thought and conduct in which they have been educated; but English students are at least expected to be “up” in the latest scientific discovery, almost in the latest philosophical conceit; whereas the maxim in China has been that wisdom lies in the past, that the way to excellence is to strive perpetually back towards the high standard of the ancients, that change is practically synonymous with deterioration, and the idea of intellectual progress an insult to the sages of old. It is almost as though the worship of the Bible which has been declared to prevail in England, were translated into practice by making familiarity with its contents a crucial if not a supreme test of erudition; or as though, to deal with centuries instead of millennia, acquaintance with Shakespeare were taken as a conclusive, instead of an incidental, standard of merit. And assuredly he who has laid to heart the infinite knowledge of human nature and of the springs of human action with which Shakespeare’s pages teem, will have little in that respect left to learn. But a knowledge of the Bible and of Shakespeare, as profound as a Chinese student must possess of Confucius and *The Odes*, would hardly have engendered the discoveries of Newton and of Watt! There would be wanting—to use the word in the comprehensive sense in which it was employed by our old writers—a knowledge of Mathematics. “He who knows not mathematics,” wrote Roger Bacon, “cannot know other sciences, and, what is more, he cannot discover his own ignorance or find the proper remedies.” And so, while recognizing the high merit of the Chinese system of competitive examination as a principle, foreigners acquainted with the country have opined that no great forward movement could be expected until a change was introduced in the standard objects of study.

But in proportion to the very crystallization of the system was the difficulty of introducing a solvent. To propose the introduction of western knowledge into the curriculum of education, and of Western science as a test-subject into the examinations, was to assail the very stronghold of conservatism, the very principle of the national polity.¹ The so-called literati, who constitute the mind of China, have been indoctrinated with the maxims of Confucius from the earliest dawn of their intelligence, and so with their fathers before them for a hundred generations. The lore of the sages has, for more than two thousand years, constituted, in their eyes, a “liberal education,” and a sufficient standard of knowledge and morality.

Yet certain choice spirits were quick, even in the early days of foreign intercourse, to perceive that it did entail a necessity for

¹ See Preface to *The Chinese Government*, &c. By W. F. Mayers. London: 1878.

change, to suit the newer day. The barbarian might be, and probably was, a barbarian still; but he clearly possessed much valuable knowledge which the Chinaman did not possess, and which it was desirable he should acquire. But how to introduce it? One scheme propounded by a Chinese literate, at Shanghai (in 1875), was to establish a college for the instruction of foreigners in the Chinese classics, in order that they might become qualified to enter the mandarinatè through the recognized channel of the examinations, and that China might so gain the benefit of their administrative talent! Another method tried was to send young Chinese abroad to be educated, but they came back in a measure "denationalized."¹ To the Cabinet presided over by Prince Kung, in 1866, belongs the credit of having first proposed² to introduce "Mathematics" as a special subject of study—that term evidently representing in his mind, as it did in Bacon's, "all the physical science of the time." It was in a strain somewhat akin to that of the learned monk, that the Prince argued in favour of erecting a special department in the Tung-wen College at Peking, "to which scholars of a high grade might be admitted, and in which men from the West should be invited to give instruction." But the literati were not yet prepared for a change in the system of education, still less in that of the time-honoured examinations. "Men from the West" were appointed to professorships, but "scholars of high grade" had not yet opened their minds to the situation. In vain did the Prince contend, with a true perception of the national weakness, that to take up Western Science as an object of study was only to receive back, at a more advanced stage, knowledge which Europe itself had formerly derived from China; and that, so far from it being "a shame to learn from the people of the West," the real disgrace lay in "being content to lag in the rear of others." Although still at the height of his reputation, and writing with the assent, if not at the instigation, of the great officials³ whose impulse has done so much to urge forward the laggard wheels of Chinese statesmanship, he was still before his time. Foreign professors were appointed; but, as an educational measure, the foreign department of the Tung-wen Kwan fell flat; a few inferior scholars only availed themselves of its opportunities, and anecdotes were told of comical effects produced by these early efforts. Nearly a generation, indeed, had lapsed since the Treaty of Tientsin began to bring foreigners into a measure of contact with the officials and people, before the Imperial Government perceived—or, before they

¹ *Memorial to the Throne*, by a Censor, in the Spring of 1887.

² *Memorial by the Tsung-li Yamen (Board of Foreign Affairs), submitting Reasons for the Education of Chinese in Foreign Science and Languages, and Proposing Rules for the Selection and Encouragement of Students.* d. 5th year of Tung-Chih (1866.)

³ "Provincial Governors, such as Tso Tsung-tang and Li Hung-chang, are firm in the conviction [that it is necessary to introduce the learning and mechanical arts of Western nations], and constantly presenting it in their addresses to the Throne."—*Ibid.*

dared to suggest—the crucial change. It was reserved for the present Cabinet, under the leadership of Prince Chun, father of the reigning Emperor, and virtual Prime Minister at the present moment, to point the educational wedge by advising the introduction of “**Mathematics**” into the competitive examinations.

In England such reforms are mooted in Parliament; in China the method is by memorial to the Throne. And, somewhat as Western statesmen are believed to occasionally prepare the public mind for change through the medium of the Press, so the subject is occasionally led up to in China by the publication of such memorials in the *Peking Gazette*. There exist, as is well known, certain officers called censors, whose function it is to address the Emperor on any subject that appears to them to require notice. They accuse high mandarins of malpractice, they remonstrate about State backslidings, they occasionally advocate State action; but they more often oppose, with more than Papal obstinacy, the very idea of change. It is well understood that the hostility of the censors has been one great obstacle to the construction of railways, which the leading Chinese statesmen have, for several years, been willing to undertake. But even among censors there are, seemingly, exceptions to the rule; and one more enlightened than the rest reopened, last spring—not improbably with High connivance—the question of bettering the educational system. His memorial was referred by the Empress-Regent to Prince Chun and the principal officers of State for consideration, and serves as a text for the document in which the latter advocate the proposed reform. It may help us to appreciate the conditions of the problem if we go on, now, to trace, in the memorialists’ own language, the arguments by which they seek to establish the necessity for change.

A Chinese memorial is nothing if not historical, nor has any argument a chance of acceptance which is not based on precedent. The first care, accordingly, in the present instance, is to trace previous educational efforts, and to prove that the innovation is really only a reversion to the methods of the past.

So far back then, we are told, as the reign of Tao-Kwang (the reigning Emperor at the time of the *Arrow* war), again during that of his successor Hien-Fung, and again during that of the last emperor, Tung Chih, high officers of State memorialized in favour of recognizing “**mathematics**” as a prime object of study—

“but inasmuch as there were existing established rules governing the selection of graduates at the metropolitan and provincial examinations, it was most difficult to introduce innovations . . . and in each case the Boards decided that the proposed measure was a violation of established usages, and the matter was stopped!”

¹ *Memorial from the Tung-li Yamen, submitting a Proposal for the Introduction of Mathematics and other Western Sciences into the Civil Competitive Examinations, Provincial and Metropolitan.* d 12th year of Kwang-Sü (1887.)

We have here presented, in a nutshell, the position of the obstructives; and it would be difficult to illustrate better than in the following sentence the quaint method of attack :—

“ Mathematics (urge the Reformers) is classed as one of the six arts (these being propriety, music, archery, charioteering, study, and mathematics); and during the Chow dynasty, in advancing their men of talent and virtue, they considered those who understood mathematics as belonging to the six professions; and in the Tang dynasty men qualified in mathematics were selected for official preferment.”

Other instances are quoted to prove that “ people of the present day, who regard mathematics as a purely Western science, have not given the subject their serious attention ;” and we come eventually to the kernel of the matter in the following proposal, whose boldness will be appreciated in proportion as we realize the rigidity of the system it is proposed to change :—

“ . . . We, the Ministers, are aware that the regulations governing the civil competitive examinations cannot be lightly changed ; yet, for the sake of encouraging men of ability, the existing methods might be modified. It is proposed, therefore, that His Majesty direct the Provincial Literary Chancellors to issue, at the competitive examinations, besides the subject usually given in classics and poetry, a theme on mathematics ; and should there be candidates for honours in that study, and they be found proficient, that their examination papers be submitted to the inspection of the Tsung-li Yamen, and their names be officially registered. That, further, when the provincial examination occurs, the successful graduates first proceed to the Tsung-li Yamen and there submit themselves to an examination in philosophy, mathematics, mechanics, engineering, naval and military tactics, marine artillery, torpedoes, international law and history ; and, should any one be proficient in any of the above subjects, that he be sent to compete at the Civil Literary Examinations in Peking, under the same conditions as the other candidates.”

We have thus provision made for the introduction of mathematics as a standard subject at the Provincial Examinations ; and—although it has not, apparently, been ventured yet to introduce them as a feature in the examination for LL.D. at Peking—a separate examination, to be held at the Foreign Office, will indicate for special selection those who, besides getting their degree on the old lines, have successfully studied the extra subjects. The memorialists appear thus to have devised an ingenious scheme for introducing mathematics into the curriculum of education, and even of the examinations up to a high point, without hustling too severely the prejudices of the literary *élite*. In their own words, “ by adopting the above modifications for securing men of varied accomplishments, the existing regulations for examining and promoting literary men will not be changed, while they will serve the important purpose of encouraging men of talent.”—Nor does the scheme end here. Having laid down certain lines for the introduction of Western Science as an object of study, they go on next to suggest a way of turning the

newly cultivated talent to the best account. Those (mathematical) graduates who have passed successfully through the Metropolitan Examinations

"will be retained at the capital and wait for appointment to the Tung-wen College, where they will act as compilers and devote themselves to further study, until they may be sent to travel abroad or receive diplomatic appointments; selection to be made from time to time in accordance with merit and ability. In this manner those who manage our foreign relations will not be empty babblers, and they will moreover excel in usefulness those who are proficient in Western arts without the complementary literary qualification."

Such are the main features of this remarkable document, whose significance will be recognized by all who are familiar with Chinese antecedents. From contemptuous disdain of foreigners as barbarians, leading statesmen have come to admit that we do, after all, know more than they; that "it is high time some plan should be devised for infusing new elements of strength into the Government;" and that "the only way of effecting this is to introduce the learning and mechanical arts of Western nations." We must not place too high an estimate on the degree of progress indicated. Many high-class *literati* will take precisely the view which the memorialists deprecate—that it is derogating from Chinese superiority to condescend to learn from the foreigner; thousands and tens of thousands of inferior standing, whose vanity is in inverse proportion to their knowledge, will hold the same idea; and years must elapse, a new generation probably arise, before the new learning can make itself felt, can produce an appreciable effect in enlarging the mind of the nation. But the fact remains that the necessity for a new departure has been admitted. The provisions made for special examination and selection of graduates who show eagerness after the new culture, afford opportunity, in the meantime, for educating a class of men better able than the present generation to cope with the new order.—Nor can the ambassadors and their suites, returning home after years of intercourse with Europeans, fail to leave, each in his degree, the circle with which he resumes contact. There has been little time yet for this influence to work, but much may be expected from it in the future. Kwo Sung-tao, the first Minister to England, was of no great importance before he left China, and subsided into insignificance on his return. Chung-How, the first envoy to Russia, lost his reputation and very nearly his head, through the bungle he made at Livadia. Li Fung-pao, the first Minister to Berlin, was not of any great account either, among his own people, and was disgraced on a charge of peculation, after his return. The Marquis Tseng was the first who might have been expected to take a high position; and the expectation has been amply verified. He has been made a member of the Foreign Board, and there is evidence that his voice is influential in the State Councils. Men like

Hung-Chun,¹ the present Minister at Berlin, are being educated to follow in his footsteps; and what these men do in the higher circles will be done, each in his own degree, by the graduates who are to be sent, at the expense of the State, to travel and inform themselves in Western lands. This practice was early adopted by the Japanese, and has developed so far that almost every Japanese statesman of repute seems now to include a voyage to Europe in his diplomatic education. China goes more slowly, as becomes the difference in national character; but it seems at last decided that men of approved scholarship shall be sent—a certain number each year—on a grand tour to the West, on the understanding that each will avail himself of the opportunity to improve his knowledge of the particular branch of Western science which he may have taken up. All these men will bring back with them new ideas, new impressions, new knowledge, which cannot fail to act as solvents upon the forms of thought that have ruled in China, unchallenged and unshaken, while the West has been “spinning,” with varying but never-ceasing momentum, “down the ringing grooves of change.”

II.

It may not be uninteresting, now we have ascertained the nature and import of the new departure which those responsible for the government of China are trying to effect, to examine the plea of original ownership by which they would fain commend the innovation.

“As to the imputation,” says Prince Kung, in the Memorial we have already quoted, “of abandoning the methods of China, is it not altogether a fictitious charge? For on inquiry it will be found that Western science had its root in the astronomy of China, which Western scholars confess themselves to have derived from Eastern lands. They have minds adapted to reasoning and abstruse study, so that they were able to deduce from it new arts which shed a lustro on those nations; but in reality the original belonged to China, and Europeans learned from us.”

The statement is awry, but it does not follow that it is wholly baseless.² Neither in accuracy of premiss nor in severity of logic will Chinese argument always satisfy the requirements of scientific accuracy. Nor would any claim be too extravagant where the national vanity is at stake. Tradition affirms that Abraham taught astronomy to the Egyptians; and the Chinese are capable of claiming Abraham as an “original” connection! Everything seems in course of being traced to the Altaic plateau from whence, at some period more or less remote, the Chinese are said to have migrated, or to the Chaldean lowland in which the “roots” of so much knowledge have been lately discovered. And if Prince Kung had been content to affirm that both China and Europe were indebted to a

¹ Hung-Chun is the Chwang-Yuan, or *Optimus* of Hanlin graduates of his year—a degree which represents, as we have seen, the very *crème de la crème* of literary talent in the Empire. Twenty years ago such a man would have scorned the post.

common centre, he would have been more likely to conciliate a charitable hearing: astronomy may have been "derived from Eastern lands," but hardly so far east as China. Astronomical knowledge of a kind the Chinese certainly possessed, before the days of Ricci and Schaal; but history will hardly support a pretension that it is to them we are indebted for our first conceptions on the subject. The Prince's statement must be approached—if approached at all—with a charitable willingness to perceive a modicum of truth where such may be discerned, without tying the national trumpeter too closely *au pied de la lettre*. The subject has, it may be confessed, more academic than practical interest; but it has an interest wider than the Chinese themselves suspect, and bearings of which they have certainly never realized the extent.

It is noteworthy, at the outset, that the Prince enjoys no monopoly of the conceit. Every foreigner who has cared to discuss the question in conversation with Chinese will have heard the claim that Western inventions had their origin in China—heard it, probably, with a smile more benign than credulous, and without always remembering that his interlocutor might, if he had known or condescended, have quoted one who stands high on the list of Oriental students in support of the plea. Abel Remusat suggested,¹ more than sixty years ago, that Europe was indebted to China—not, certainly, for the beginnings of all knowledge, as Prince Kung would have us believe, but for a good many first ideas which European brains have since perfected; and we cannot do better than recall here, as tersely as possible, the arguments of the essay in which he sustained the thesis. History gives the claim at least this measure of support. It shows that circumstances were favourable, at a certain period, for the transmission to Europe of certain inventions then familiar in the East, and which actually made their appearance, for the first time, a short while subsequently in the West. It establishes that what is occurring now is but a reversal of what took place 600 years ago, when the Mongol irruption combined with the Crusades to level for a time the barrier that had grown up between East and West—a barrier that was reconstituted by the interposition of Islam, but which is now being turned, if not overthrown afresh, by the adventurous enterprise of Europe. Then it was the overflow of the Tartar hordes which threatened to submerge Europe; now it is the restlessness of Europe which is disturbing the successor of the Great Khan. His question is, whether the Mongol outbreak of the thirteenth century—instead of being, as we are apt to believe, wholly destructive—may not have been effective in conveying to Europe certain knowledge that had originated in Asia, but had been confined there by the isolation of its people.

¹ *Mémoires sur les relations politiques des Princes Chrétiens, et particulièrement des rois de France, avec les Empereurs Mongols, par Abel Remusat: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Vols. vi. and vii. Paris: 1826-7.*

It must, of course, not be overlooked that this was one only of the great movements that were bringing the nations of the old world into contact, on the confines of Europe and Asia. The Mahomedans had conquered the Holy Land, and four crusades had flowed and ebbed in the effort to dislodge them, before the Tartars added their quota to the general confusion. Guizot has emphasized, in his well-known Lectures,¹ the enlightening effect upon Europe of the contact with Greek and Saracenic civilization. We are concerned, now, solely with the Mongols, and need consider the Mahomedan complication only in so far as it tended to promote intercourse between West and East by suggesting a community of interests arising out of a common hostility to Islam.

The Mongol Empire may be said to have begun with the establishment by Genghis Khan of his capital at Karakorum, A.D. 1206. His tribe had already succeeded in subjecting its neighbours, and all Tartary soon acknowledged his supremacy. Then ensued the great series of conquests which whelmed Asia and spread terror throughout Europe. Impelled, it would seem, by the pent-up energies which had found sudden outlet, the Tartars penetrated Russia, overran Poland and Hungary,² and threw their shadow over France. It was dread of their approach which inspired Louis IX. with the historical pun about Tartars and Tartarus that is said to have permanently affected the spelling of the name. Gregory IX. proposed a crusade against the new enemy; but failed, it would seem, as much on account of the terror they inspired as of his differences with the Emperor, who was himself menaced. Innocent IV. sent envoys in 1225 to the Mongol generals who commanded in Russia and Asia Minor, with the double object of commending Christianity and deprecating their violence; but seems to have taken little by his motion, although Batou at least passed his envoys on to the Great Khan, who sent letters in return.

The wave had, however, spent itself in Europe; the invaders had been compelled to retire from Hungary, mainly it would seem by the very desolation they had themselves caused; and when, in 1248, the French king was halting at Cyprus, on his way to the Holy Land, ambassadors reached him from the Mongol Satrap of Persia with proposals of allied action. St. Louis, however, seems to have been more anxious about the conversion than the co-operation of his would-be friends.³ He failed, at any rate, to knit an alliance which might have altered the fate of his expedition; for, though the Mongol flood had begun to subside in Europe, the tide was still

¹ *Histoire Générale de la Civilisation en Europe*, &c. Guizot. Paris: 1828.

² Batou, grandson of Genghis Khan, established himself in Kapchak (S.E. Russia) in 1224, and overran Poland and Hungary in 1240-1.

³ The story of this much-disputed mission is elaborately discussed in Remusat's essay. The proposal seems to have been that one should attack the Sultan of Egypt while the other attacked the Khalif, so as to prevent either rendering the other assistance.

flowing in Asia. Houlagou completed, in 1258, his proposed campaign against Bagdad, overthrew the power of the Khalifs, establishing a dynasty which was to last for nearly a hundred years in Persia; and commenced, shortly after, the movement on Palestine in which he had wished apparently to secure European co-operation.

The whole vast empire which the Mongols built up, was, as we have seen, swayed at the outset by one man; and so long as that unity was kept up, the invading hordes were irresistible. But the time came when the nomadic impulse subsided, and the central connection grew weak. The Tartars of Russia and the Tartars of Persia all but ceased in their allegiance, and were thrown on their own resources. Then, before the counter-flow of Mahomedanism, the tide began to turn, and the great Satraps who, in the first burst of victory, had demanded tribute from Western Europe, tried to revive the crusades by offers of alliance against the common foe. Envoys from Abagu, who had succeeded Houlagou on the throne of Persia, reached Pope Clement with overtures of co-operation, about the time (1267) that preparations were being made for the final crusade that was to cost King Louis his life, and to lay the foundation of our own Prince Edward's military reputation; but Louis wasted his resources and died in Tunis, leaving Edward to conduct a barren, though brilliant, campaign. Fresh proposals were made to the latter (in 1274) shortly after his return; and again, three years later, a Tartar embassy visited London in search of help. It was to the Pope, apparently, as the acknowledged head of Christendom, that these appeals were generally addressed, but they seem to have been treated somewhat as circular despatches, to be passed on after perusal. It is, at any rate, on certain of these documents, unearthed by him in the archives of France, that Remusat's interesting narrative and equally interesting speculations are mainly founded. For though the Mongol envoys failed to achieve an active alliance, they opened up an intercourse whose extent had been well-nigh forgotten till his researches disclosed the buried record. An embassy, for instance, in 1285, from Argoun,¹ the then ruler of Persia, was answered by the despatch of envoys from France in 1288; the arrival of Tartar envoys in England is noted in the following and second succeeding year; and the despatch, finally, of a letter from our own Edward II., from Northampton, in 1307, brings us near the close of the story. The Tartar Sovereigns of Persia succumbed to the Mussulman in 1355, and the intercourse which had lasted for nearly a century was again broken off. Remusat counts nine leading attempts (*tentatives principales*) made by Christian princes to connect themselves with the Mongols, and fifteen embassies sent by the Tartars into Europe;

¹ Remusat notes that Argoun's letter (the original of which he discovered in the royal archives) still acknowledges the suzerainty of Kublai, the Mongol conqueror of China, whom Marco Polo found reigning at Peking.

and he makes the striking reflection that history might have been changed if the negotiations had succeeded, and East and West had combined against Islam. But the course of events ran otherwise; the crusading spirit had well-nigh evaporated, and the Tartars seem to have got little but civil answers and commendations of Christianity, in reply to their proposals.

Nothing, indeed, is more curious than the constant rumours of successful proselytism which seem to have been current in Europe during these negotiations, and which have survived to our own day in the mysterious legends of Prester John that still float hazily in the atmosphere of tradition. Again and again do reports seem to have gained credence that the Tartar ruler of Persia, nay, the very Great Khan himself, had embraced Christianity. The wish was no doubt in some degree father to the thought; but it is also likely that the Mongol chiefs—indifferent about religion at the core, and wanting Christian help against the Moslem—sent specious messages, which the European ecclesiastics and Georgian and Armenian Christians who served principally as go-betweens, coloured still more highly in delivery. Enough has, however, been said of the political intercourse between the two regions, and of the conditions under which it arose. We may go on, now, to consider the extent and probable effect on European civilization.

"Two systems of civilization had," Remusat remarks, "arisen, spread, and perfected themselves at the two extremities of the old world, through the effect of independent causes, without communication and, consequently, without mutual influence. Suddenly the events of war and political combinations place in contact these two great bodies, so long strangers one to the other. Solemn ambassadorial interviews are not the only occasions of approach between them; others, more obscure but more efficacious, were created through unperceived but innumerable ramifications—through the journeys of private travellers, drawn to the two ends of the world, with commercial objects, along the paths of envoys or armies. The Mongol irruption, overthrowing everything, covered all distances, filled up all gaps, and brought together all peoples; the events of war transported thousands of individuals to immense distances from the places where they were born."

History has, he remarks, preserved the memory of journeys of kings (of Georgia and Armenia), of ambassadors, and of missionaries who were led by political motives to the depths of Asia, and of distinguished Mongols who came to Rome, Barcelona, Valence, Lyons, Paris, London, and Northampton. But how many persons less known must have followed in their footsteps, either as servants or drawn by the desire of gain, or by curiosity to visit hitherto unknown countries!

"Chance has preserved the names of a few. The first envoy who came to find the king of Hungary on behalf of the Tartars was an Englishman, who had been banished from his country and who, after wandering all over Asia, had ended by taking service with the Mongols. A Flemish cordwainer met, in the depths of Tartary, a woman of Metz who had been carried off from Hungary, a Parisian jeweller whose brother was estab

lished at Paris on the Grand-Pont, and a young man from the environs of Rouen who had chanced to be at the capture of Belgrade; he saw there also Russians, Hungarians, and Flemings. A chorister, after having travelled through Eastern Asia, came back to die in the cathedral at Chartres; a Tartar was helmet-maker (*fournisseur de casques*) to Philippe-Bel. Jean de Plan-Carpin (one of the emissaries sent by Pope Innocent in 1245) found, at the Court of Gayouk, a Russian gentleman who served as interpreter; merchants of Breslau, Poland, and Austria accompanied him in his journey to Tartary; others came back with him through Russia. These were Genoese, Pisans, and two Venetian merchants whom chance had led to Bokhara. From thence they had followed a Mongol envoy, whom Houlagou was sending to Kublai, sojourned several years in China and Tartary, came back with letters from the Great Khan for the Pope, returned to the Great Khan, taking with them the celebrated Marco Polo, and again quitted the Court of Kublai to return to Venice."

Journeys of this kind were frequent also in the following century. We may well believe, too, as Remusat suggests, that those which are remembered form a small proportion only of those which were undertaken, and that there were, at that time, more people able to make long journeys than to write a relation of them. "Many of these adventurers remained, no doubt, and died in the countries they had gone to visit; others returned home as obscure as they had set out, but the imagination filled with what they had seen, to talk about it in their families; exaggerating, no doubt, but leaving amid many ridiculous stories, in monasteries, in the castles of the nobles, and even in the lowest strata of society, precious seeds, destined to fructify a little later." Not only were new roads opened up to commerce and for the exchange of Eastern and Western products, but, "what was still better worth, foreign customs, unknown notions, extraordinary productions, were presented to the minds of Europeans who had been confined, since the fall of the Roman Empire, within a too narrow circle." People began to appreciate the importance of the East, interest was awakened in the arts, creeds and language of its people; the desire of discovery was stimulated.

It would be beside the purpose to examine the results in Asia itself of a movement so powerful and so far-reaching. We are concerned only with the effects in Europe; and here is the language in which Remusat states a conclusion "not perhaps entirely new, but to which the facts he had been reviewing lend a support it hardly possessed" before he had marshalled them:—

"Before the establishment of the relations to which the Crusades first, and still more the Mongol irruption, gave rise between the East and the West, the greater part of the inventions which signalized the close of the Middle Ages had been known for centuries to the Asiatics. The polarity of the loadstone had been observed and utilized in China from remote ages. Explosive powders had been known from all time to the Hindoos and Chinese.¹ The latter had, in the tenth century, thunder chariots (*chars-à-*

¹ Mayers argues, however, that gunpowder probably only became known to the Chinese about 550 A.D., "and then merely to a partial extent and from foreign sources

foudre) which appear to have been cannon; . . . and Houlagou, when starting for Persia, had in his army a corps of Chinese artillery. On another hand, the *editio princeps* of the (Chinese) *almanacs*, engraved on wooden blocks, is of the year 952. . . . The use of paper money was adopted by the Mongols in China,¹ and was known to the Persians under the same name the Chinese gave it: . . . Finally, playing cards . . . were conceived in China in the year 1120.—There are, besides, in the beginnings of each of these inventions, peculiar traits which seem to indicate their origin. I will not speak of the compass, whose antiquity in China Hager seems to me to have victoriously maintained, but which must have found its way to Europe by means of the Crusados, before the Mongol irruption, as proved by Jacques Vitry and others. But the most ancient playing cards, those of the game of *tarots*,² have a remarkable analogy in their shape, the designs they bear, their size and number, with the cards used by the Chinese. Cannon were the first firearms used in Europe; they were also, it would seem, the only ones which the Chinese knew at this epoch. . . . We have the example of another usage which manifestly followed the same route—viz., that of the *swan-pan*, or arithmetical machine of the Chinese, which was, without doubt, brought to Europe by the army of Batou, and which has so spread in Russia and Poland that women of the people who cannot read use nothing else for their housekeeping accounts and their petty dealings. The conjecture which attributes a Chinese origin to the primitive idea of European typography is so natural that it was put forward even before the circumstances which rendered it probable had been collated; it was the idea of Paul Jove and of De Mendoza, that a Chinese book might have been brought by way of Scythia and Muscovy before the Portuguese reached India. It was developed by an anonymous Englishman, and if one puts aside the printing in movable type, which is certainly an European invention, it is difficult to see what can be opposed to a hypothesis so full of likelihood.

"But the supposition acquires a much higher degree of probability if it is applied to the *ensemble* of the discoveries in question. All had been made in Eastern Asia; all were ignored in the West. Communication takes place, is prolonged during a century and a half, and hardly has another century elapsed before they are all known in Europe. Their source is enveloped in clouds; the country where they exhibited themselves, the men who have produced them, are equally matter of doubt; it is not the enlightened countries which are their theatre; it is not the learned who are their authors: men of the people, obscure artisans, cease to shine, one after another, these unexpected lights. Nothing seems better to show the effect of communication; nothing could accord better with what we have said above of invisible channels, of unperceived ramifications, by which the knowledge of Eastern people was able to penetrate Europe. Most of these inventions present themselves at first in the state of infancy where the Asiatics left them, and this circumstance hardly allows us to entertain a doubt as to their origin. Some were immediately put in practice; others remain for a time enveloped in an obscurity which hides their progress; and are taken, on their appearance, for new inventions: all, perfected soon, and, as it were, fecundated by the genius of Europeans, act together, and

¹ Marco Polo mentions paper money as one of the most marvellous proofs of the power and intelligence of the Great Khan. But its use seems to have been known to the Chinese long before the Mongol dynasty. It is spoken of as having been tried under the Tang dynasty about the year 800; and appears again in a more fully developed form, 160 years later, under the Sung. "The Chinese had, in fact, suffered all the misery arising from an over-issued and depreciated paper currency when it was hailed in Europe as the invention of the philosopher's stone."—See *Chinese Currency. Coin and Paper Money*. By W. Vissering. Leyden: 1877.

² A game played at one time, in France and Italy, under the names of *tarots* and *tarocchi*. The cards bore figures of money, swords, people, &c. &c.

communicate to the human intelligence the greatest movement of which the memory has been preserved. So, by this shock of peoples, was dispelled the darkness of the Middle Ages. Catastrophes which seemed an unmitigated affliction for the human race, served to awaken it from the lethargy of centuries; and the destruction of twenty empires was the price at which Providence granted Europe the light of her present civilization."

Such are the facts which Remusat established, and such the conclusions to which he was led. They bear upon a page of history which was previously little understood, and which is still comparatively unfamiliar. The Mongol irruption is still, for most of us, a sort of historical nightmare. The Mahomedan invasion of Palestine stands forth crisp and clear; but the subjection of Georgia and Armenia to the Mongol impresses us faintly by comparison. Saladin we know, and Acre we know, but Bagdad is associated in our minds with Haroun-al-Raschid far more clearly than with Houlagou. The crusades of St. Louis and Prince Edward are leading incidents in schoolboy lore; but many of us fail to realize that intercourse, so prolonged and far-reaching, occurred between the princes of Europe and the satraps of the Great Khan, or that Marco Polo and his relatives were three only among a host of Europeans who were wandering over Asia. Even Remusat's brilliant essay hardly saved from fresh oblivion many of the facts he relates. Yet the story has so much interest that those to whom it is familiar will, we believe, pardon its repetition; while others will admit, for their intrinsic value, the somewhat lengthy quotations which were necessary to elucidate his contention. Such statements as Prince Kung's savour too much of the obsolete pretence to national and imperial superiority over the rest of the world, not to repel Western readers; but for a more modest claim—that China supplied the germ of many inventions which were carried, in Europe, to a higher pitch of excellence—there is, clearly, much to be said. If it will facilitate the acceptance, by her *literati*, of knowledge in which "Western scholars" are admittedly pre-eminent, to believe that it "had its root in the astronomy of China," by all means let them move in their own way and justify the movement by their own logic! It is indeed far from improbable that much of this vain-glory is intended chiefly for homo consumption. "Call it," says a recent Chinese writer, "Western science, and our scholars will think it shame to meddle with it; but once let it be known that it had its origin in China, and they will be ashamed to show ignorance of it." As regards foreigners, however, the Chinese case has, without doubt, been damaged by its own advocates. It may, therefore, be neither uninteresting nor inopportune to recall the more moderate views put forward by a sinologue of a past generation.

It would lead us far to examine in detail the evidences of progress that may be really found in the last twenty-five years of Chinese history. Margary's murder on the borders of Yunnan led to the

great Emperor who once considered all the world his tributary sending ambassadors as an equal to the Sovereign of Europe. The Kuldja dispute with Russia led to the connection of Peking by telegraph with the outer world and with the chief cities of the Empire. The recent war with France showed the need for a stronger fleet, and for railways as a means of concentrating troops. All this entailed a demand for funds, which inspired approval of projects for developing the mineral resources of the country. The growing requirements of commerce, imperfectly met by the introduction of foreign dollars, combined with the depreciated condition of the copper coinage to gain sanction to the project of a mint. But in all these matters the Chinese have found themselves driven to seek foreign aid. They had to engage foreigners literally as guides, philosophers, and friends for their first ambassadors; they had to look to foreigners for their telegraph plant and for instruction in its use; they have to send to Europe for their ironclads, and to engage Englishmen to navigate them; they have to purchase in Europe the plant of the railway which is being constructed—by foreign engineers—between Taku and Tientsin; they have to purchase in Europe their mining machinery, and to get foreigners to manage it; they have to send to Birmingham for a mint, and will have to engage Europeans to superintend it. No wonder, then, the conviction has been borne in upon Chinese statesmen, that it was “high time some plan should be devised for infusing new elements of strength into the government of China,” and that the “only way of effecting this was to introduce the learning and mechanical arts of Western nations;” so that they may have “men to manage their foreign relations who are not mere empty babblers,” and that they may “render themselves independent [of foreigners] by making themselves masters of their arts.” The step which has been now taken will be slow in operation—slow probably in commending itself to the student class, slow in the effect it may be hoped to produce upon the national mind; but it is much, in a country so vain and conservative as China, to gain admission for a new principle. The opening effected by the wedge may be a very narrow one, but the idea once admitted will filter down and make way among the educated classes. Once convinced by the reasoning of their statesmen that they must have these Western appliances, the Chinese will end by admitting the advantage of “not needing to look to others for assistance.” Whether they will ever attain, or are capable of attaining, the European standard, and dispensing with that assistance, is a widely different question which we are not now concerned to raise.

THE RIGHT HON. W. E. FORSTER.

THIS is the biography of an eminent man, admirably told, and full of deep and various interest. The circumstances under which it was written almost necessarily give it somewhat of the character of a panegyric. W. E. Forster's was one of those strong, energetic, and self-asserting natures that inspire ardent love and passionate hatred. In this picture of him by an attached friend, the splendour of his public and private virtues is perhaps hardly sufficiently relieved by the inevitable shadows of human imperfection. Still, the lineaments presented to us, in a great measure in the letters of the original, may be accepted as forming a true likeness; and Mr. Reid, in dealing with matters of controversy, is invariably fair. We have the portrait of a man of powerful intellect, devouring energy, quick enthusiasm, unswerving honesty and independence, untiring industry; a man scrupulously conscientious and fair-minded, whose rough speech and somewhat forbidding exterior partially concealed from the world a most sympathetic and tender nature; whose life was a constant striving after a pure and lofty ideal, and was illustrated by almost inexhaustible capacity for love and friendship, by unflinching charity for enemies, by keen hatred of wrong and keen sympathy for suffering, which extended to the whole dumb creation.

It would be impossible to form a just estimate of the character of W. E. Forster, without taking account of his parentage and early training. Although he was generally regarded, and pleased to be regarded, as the complete type of a Yorkshireman, his ancestors are first heard of in Durham, in the seventeenth century, as among the earliest members of the Society of Friends. In 1752, Josiah Forster settled at Tottenham, where his son became a land agent, and his grandson, William Forster, father of the statesman, was born about 1784. William Forster was not less distinguished in his own walk of life than the subject of this notice. In early youth, obeying the spiritual call which is the sole qualification for the unpaid office of a Quaker minister, he devoted himself to a religious profession. It was a vocation for which he seemed to be specially unfitted by nature. His frame was unwieldy; he suffered in social intercourse from incurable shyness. In his rare seasons of leisure, he was

subject to fits of lethargy, which completely paralyzed his physical and mental powers. But at the call of duty, every impediment seemed to vanish. Fervid zeal and unbounded charity endued him with activity, decision, and extraordinary eloquence. In the course of fifty years of missionary labour, philanthropic as well as religious, he frequently traversed Great Britain, Ireland, and the North American continent, cheerfully encountering great fatigues, dangers, and privations. His preaching was so persuasive that he seemed, to unemotional hearers, to be under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost. *The teaching and example of this singularly humble-minded man operated powerfully on many young persons of both sexes, of high social position and personal merit. It was at William Forster's suggestion that Thomas Fowell Buxton began the labours for the abolition of slavery which gave him an honourable place among the benefactors of mankind. It was in response to his summons that Elizabeth Fry, and other ladies of the Gurney family and connection, abandoned a life of ease and refinement to reclaim their fallen sisters in Newgate Prison, and other dens of infamy in English towns. The companion of Mrs Fry in her pious work at Newgate was Anna Fowell Buxton. Anna had shone in society, not only by unusual beauty, grace, and accomplishments, but by a singularly bright and joyous spirit. She had been distinguished by the special regard of George III and his family. Suddenly she renounced the world, joined the Society of Friends, to which her mother had belonged, and became one of its ministers. No two persons would, a little before, have presented a stronger contrast than the fashionable beauty and the timid, ungainly William Forster. They were now drawn together, not only by the work of a common ministry, but by a hatred of slavery and a love of dumb animals which in each amounted to a passion. Association begot strong affection; and they married in 1816, with the approval of all their friends. William Forster took his bride to a cottage in the village of Bradpole, near Bridport, situated on a slope of one of the most beautiful valleys of Dorsetshire. In this humble home their only son, W. L. Forster, was born, on the 11th of July 1818, and passed the years of childhood. The household was on the modest scale suited to a narrow income, and was frequently broken up for a time by spiritual calls, which his parents obeyed as sacred. Shortly before his birth Anna Forster felt impelled to set out on a three months' mission to Ireland, a country which her husband always regarded with particular affection. In 1820, William Forster, after a severe conflict between natural feeling and a sense of duty, left wife and son, to engage in a course of religious and philanthropic labours in North America, which occupied five years. An anecdote told by Mr. Reid illustrates in an amusing way the conditions under which the boy's earliest years were passed. "He was travelling in a coach in the charge of his

nurse, when a benevolent old gentleman began to talk to him. 'Where is your papa, my dear?' said his fellow-traveller. 'Papa is preaching in America,' was the reply. 'And where is your mamma?' continued the gentleman. 'Mamma is preaching in Ireland,' was the answer which the astonished stranger received." William Forster, on his return to England in 1825, settled down at Bradpole, and made his son the companion of his rambles, his simple home recreations, of which gardening was the chief, and his constant visits among the neighbouring poor. The boy was never quite a boy in the ordinary sense, being a stranger to the sports and pleasures proper to his age. In the society of his parents his mind was habitually engaged in considering and discussing serious subjects; and he had formed strong opinions on the most difficult social and political questions at a period of life when the attention is generally engrossed with childish pastimes. On the other hand, although of delicate constitution originally, he grew up strong and active; and he imbibed from his parents a deep sense of religion, an enthusiasm for noble effort, an ardent sympathy for the poor and the afflicted, a passionate love of Nature, of beautiful scenery, flowers, birds, and animals, which informed and coloured his whole life. His regular education began in his tenth year as a pupil of Mr. Taylor, the Curate of Bradpole. In August 1831 he was sent to a Quaker school at Fishponds House, Bristol, and transferred thence, in October 1832, to Grove House, Tottenham, where he remained to the close of 1835. His own letters, and those of observing friends, give a clear impression of what manner of boy he was in his school-days. Frank and open in disposition, he was much under the dominion of impulse, which, though always generous, was vehement, and prone to acrimonious expression, that drew on him gentle warnings from his father and rebuke from his master. He indulged freely in physical exercise; but threw himself into study, particularly the study of mathematics and history, with extraordinary energy, under the spur of a consuming desire for distinction in a public career. All his letters breathe the most ardent love and reverence for his parents. And though on the footing of a younger brother with his father, he paid all his wishes implicit obedience. At Tottenham he had the advantage of occasional visits to the London house of his uncle, Thomas Powell Buxton, at that time M.P. for Weymouth. England then was agitated by the movement against slavery, of which Buxton was the leader. Young Forster, in his ambitious dreams, made his uncle his model, and his whole soul was in the conflict. A letter from him to his father in 1835 gives a very interesting account of a debate in the House of Commons, of which Buxton, O'Connell, and Peel were the principal figures. We give an extract from another, written about to show his extraordinary ardour in study. "I have," a set of regulations for the use of my play-time,

by which either in playtime or by getting up in the morning, or by reading in bed, I obtain in every week, not including the evenings, five and a half hours' mathematics and eleven and a half hours' reading; and I have set myself, in my leisure time in the evening, two evenings for themes, two for mathematics, one for Latin verses, and one for Greek Testament and sundries." About this time he fell under the gentle sway of two remarkable ladies, Miss Sarah Buxton and Miss Anna Gurney, who lived together at Northrepps Cottage in Norfolk, not far from Northrepps Hall, the seat of Thomas Fowell Buxton. They were called the "Cottage Ladies," and famed far and wide for ability, accomplishments, and active benevolence. The qualities of young Forster attracted their love and esteem. Seeing in him the promise of great distinction, they fostered his aspiration for a public career, and took a warm interest in all his pursuits; and their influence, applied in the plastic season of youth, was potent for good in the moulding of his life. Being now in his eighteenth year, it became necessary to decide on his future profession in life. His own thoughts and hopes had been fixed almost from childhood on the Bar, as the shortest road to a seat in Parliament. But William Forster's mind was fixed on some commercial employment, free from irreligious and immoral associations, which might secure to his son, at once, a competent income. This was a terrible disappointment to the young man, but he bowed without a murmur to his father's wishes. Forster senior, however, hesitated and wavered with characteristic indecision. Many employments were tried without leading to any definite result. Young Forster still continued his studies. "Please send me," he wrote to his parents from Darlington, "Abbot's *Trigonometry*, Hamilton's *Conic Sections*, Lacroix's *Differential Calculus*, and especially Taylor's *Elements of Algebra*." These he required as a solace in the evening after twelve hours of "dirty drudgery." Association in the anti-slavery labours of his uncle—whom the Whigs had made a baronet—gave him still more congenial occupation. Sir Thomas was busy on a scheme, which afterwards developed into the unfortunate Niger Expedition, of opening Africa to trade, educating the negroes in industrial arts, and stopping the slave traffic at its source; and invited his nephew to help in the work. Young Forster advocated the project by tongue and pen with an ability and vigour that won the warm admiration of his uncle. He was also eager to join the expedition in the peaceful capacity of an agent. All this time his father's scruples and irresolution hampered his efforts and operated greatly to his disadvantage. Scruples of his own also stood in his way. He declined a most advantageous opening made for him in his uncle's brewery from conscientious objections to selling beer, which Sir Thomas respected, though naturally unable to understand. And he refused another offer, in all other respects most acceptable,

because the commercial firm that made it trafficked in slave-grown produce.

At length, in 1841, Forster was enabled to become the partner of T. S. Fison, and soon after of William Fison, in the woollen trade at Bradford. For some years the building up a new business employed most of his time and energies. But personal affairs by no means excluded larger interests from his mind. The eager attention which he had given to the Slavery Question was now turned to what was called the "Condition of England Question;" to the pressing social and political problems which he found at his own door in the discontent, poverty, and ignorance of the English working classes. He read with avidity. The writings of Emerson, and particularly those of Carlyle, made a deep and enduring impression on his mind. He had also the advantage in these years of forming friendships with several distinguished men: Sterling, Frederick Maurice, Monckton Milnes, Carlyle, Emerson, Thomas Cooper the Chartist, and Robert Owen. Prospering business soon enabled him to set up a comfortable bachelor's establishment, first at Bolton, and afterwards at Rawdon. It was his delight to gather around him men of all classes and opinions for the discussion of questions then agitating the public mind. The condition of the masses was deplorable, and Forster was led by his strong popular sympathies to embrace the leading doctrines of Chartism and Socialism. From the very first he had created a sensation at Bradford. His towering form, his extraordinary mental and physical vigour, his blunt speech, careless, not to say slovenly, attire, and unsophisticated ways, his literary tastes excited general curiosity. Taking an active part in municipal business, he soon became a power in the town. Prosperous citizens might shake their heads over the extreme opinions he was believed to hold; but the workmen, discerning his honest anxiety for their welfare, began to look on him as a future leader. It would seem, however, that the condition of Ireland held the first place in his thoughts. In 1846 he said to Thomas Cooper the Chartist, then visiting him in Yorkshire: "If I had to take a part in the administration of affairs in this country, I would strive to accomplish two great purposes—to give relief, and lasting relief, to poor Ireland; and to get the children of the working classes out of the gutter by educating them." Shortly after this conversation, the Irish famine puts its leading profession to the test. The Society of Friends took the lead in organizing relief in England for the starving peasants, and sent William Forster, as their chief agent, to administer it in November. But already, in September, W. E. Forster had gone over to Ireland to gather information and report to his father on the condition of the people. He visited O'Connell at Derrynane, and was cordially welcomed as the nephew of Sir Fowell

Buxton. The old chief, then breaking fast in mind and body, cast a spell over his imagination that did not soon lose its power. Proceeding along the West Coast, all the horrors of one of the most terrible visitations that ever afflicted a nation gradually unfolded themselves before him. He hurried back to London to stimulate the Friends and the Committee of the British Association to greater efforts; and "relieved his mind" by heckling Lord John Russell in a personal interview. "What a strange little mortal he is," Forster wrote, "to be ruler of a mighty nation, with his dwarf-like form, and long, deep, and remarkable head, and icy cold expression, with every now and then a look of fire." In the following January he returned to Ireland, in spite of urgent claims of business, to assist his father. On coming back he published a narrative of his visit, with the view of arousing attention in England to the social condition which made such a calamity possible. "Surely," the pamphlet concluded, "such a social result as this is not only a national misfortune, but a national sin, crying loudly to every Christian citizen to do his utmost to remove it. No one of us can have a right to enjoy either riches or repose, until, to the extent of his ability, he tries to wash himself of all share in the guilt of this fearful inequality, which will be a blot in the history of our country, and make her a byword among the nations." Afterwards, in 1848, he met an Irish clergyman—a friend of John Dillon, just then proclaimed a traitor. "What a position would mine be," said the clergyman, "if he (Dillon) came to me for shelter. He knows well I should not betray him, but we could not give him room." "Send him to me," replied Forster; "he would be quite safe here. No one would suspect a Quaker." The pamphlet attracted universal notice, and greatly raised its author in public estimation.

In the summer of 1817, Thomas and Jane Carlyle passed several weeks at Rawdon. The visit included a short tour in Derbyshire, where the wisdom of the Chelsea sage occasionally exploded in vehement harangues which lost nothing of their amusing effect in Forster's letters. Monckton Milnes joined the party for a short time, and we have a laughable picture of the malicious skill with which he alternately chafed and soothed the irritable philosopher. The visit passed off harmoniously on the whole, and greatly gratified Forster, who admired the Master and deeply admired the superior qualities of his wife. "She was one of those few women," he said, "to whom a man could talk all day or listen all day with equal pleasure."

In 1848, while revolution convulsed nearly the whole Continent, the respectability of England was scared out of its wits by the comparatively harmless Chartist agitation. Forster boldly avowed his acceptance of the chief points of the Charter, while resolutely opposing a resort to any form of physical force. His courageous

independence exposed him to a storm of obloquy, which seemed for a time to carry with it a menace of financial ruin. And, whilst friends of equal social standing, and even his own family, condemned him as a firebrand, the working population of Bradford, Chartists almost to a man, rebelled against the restraints he imposed on their movement. A trip to Paris, during the Provisional Government of Lamartine, had the effect of disenchanting him with Louis Blanc's workshops, but increased the dissatisfaction of his more sober friends. He held his ground with stubborn fortitude, and angry feeling gradually died out. The Bradford working classes soon returned to their voluntary allegiance. But the reputation of a violent Radical, which clung to Forster long after he had renounced many of his early theories, proved at the very outset of his political career a serious impediment, and, later on, a cause of angry misconception, that, failing to mar it, yet strewed it with thorns. While suffering from the reproaches of friends and the bad offices of foes, he had to endure a still more distressing conflict in the secret recesses of his own mind. The writings of Carlyle, Emerson, and other sceptical thinkers of the time had gradually sapped his old Quaker faith, and plunged him in all the agonies of religious doubt. And, although this period of mental perturbation seems to have passed away without sensibly impairing his general belief in Christian revelation, it considerably modified the religious opinions in which he had been so carefully educated.

Forster's marriage with Jane, the eldest daughter of Dr. Arnold of Rugby, made the year 1850 an important epoch of his life. The union, although childless, was conspicuously and uniformly happy. Intimate connection with a family so richly endowed by Nature as that of the Arnolds, opened to him new social and intellectual resources; and the range of his domestic felicity was greatly enlarged when, a few years later, he adopted the four orphan children of his brother-in-law, William Delafield Arnold. The "aliquid amari" of nuptial bliss was supplied by his expulsion, though without breach of good feeling on either side, from the Society of Friends. He had, indeed, long before discarded the peculiar garb and most of the peculiar opinions of that body. But old and cherished ties could not be formally severed without causing a pang. In 1851 the firm of Fison & Co., in which he was partner, removed their business from Bradford to the village of Burley, in Wharfedale.

In connection with this experiment Forster built a house on the river Wharfe, called Wharfeside, in a situation of romantic beauty. Around this new home the brightest and tenderest memories of his married life cluster. The factory at Burley for some years engrossed much of his care. The plans he conceived and carried out for the education and comfort of his workmen; his constant solicitude for their welfare; the relations of love and confidence that quickly sprang up between him and them, and grew stronger every day

educational views were in harmony with his own ; and it was with a feeling of patriotic rapture that he found within his grasp the opportunity he had long coveted. We can only touch lightly on the burning question of the Education Act of 1870, but it calls for some notice as the great achievement of Forster's political life, although not, as we think, the severest test of his merits as a statesman. Up to this time education in England had been denominational and voluntary. The Church of England, being by far the most powerful spiritual organization in the kingdom, occupied most of the ground. Forster, however, found three schemes in the field—First, that of the National Education Union, for an extension, by means of increased help from the State, of the existing voluntary system ; second, that of the Birmingham League (to which Nonconformists had lately rallied as tending to promote religious equality), for free, secular, compulsory education, supported altogether by public money ; third, that of Mr. Lowe, a former Vice-President of the Council. Forster adopted and developed the plan of Mr. Lowe. He proposed to use the existing machinery, supplementing it in case of proved inadequacy by compelling the ratepayers of a school district to cover existing needs by erecting new schools ; second, to restrict religious teaching in such new schools to the study of the Bible ; third, to make education compulsory. This last article was modified by the Cabinet ; the others were embodied in a Bill which the Vice-President introduced in the Commons by a speech of remarkable power. At first the measure met with little opposition. But in a few days a storm of disapproval burst forth from the Liberal benches. The Birmingham League had looked on Forster as an exponent of their views, and the instrument of a policy which aimed at the overthrow of the Established Church. Disappointment begot anger, and the bitterest taunts came from old personal and political friends. The full blast of their wrath fell on the Chartist of other days. He was reviled as a trimmer ; as a traitor to his principles for selfish ambition. So furious was the clamour that Mr. Gladstone, absorbed in his Irish Land Bill, hung up the education measure for a time, to allow opinion to grow calm. Subsequently the Government made or accepted certain amendments ; the time-table clause, the Cowper Temple clause, clauses adopting the cumulative vote and the ballot, and increasing grants to denominational schools, which enabled the measure to pass, in principle as Forster framed it, triumphantly through both Houses. Mr. Gladstone showed his appreciation of Forster's work by promoting him to a seat in the Cabinet. But the hatred and distrust of old admirers pursued the author of the Education Act for many years. The Bradford Liberals rewarded him by a vote of censure, and by bitter opposition at the next election.

Mr. Reid, we think, has succeeded in vindicating his hero from the charges of the Birmingham League. Time and widening experience

States, and his own correspondence with distinguished Americans, had opened to him unusual sources of information. His speech against Gregory's motion was a striking success. Though not an orator, he had oratorical gifts. Bringing passionate conviction and almost unrivalled grasp and knowledge of his subject to bear, his rugged eloquence told with great effect on the House of Commons. He soon ranked in public opinion, after Cobden and Bright, as the ablest advocate of the Northern cause and the principle of non-intervention. Predictions of his future eminence began to appear in the Press. In reference to these he wrote to his wife in 1843: "The want by the Liberal party of a new man is great, and felt to be great. The old Whig leaders are worn out. There are no new Whigs. Cobden and Bright are impracticable and un-English, and there are hardly any hopeful Radicals. There is a great prize of power and influence to be aimed at." The most noteworthy circumstance in connection with these words is that they leave Mr. Gladstone altogether out of account. We have here an indication of want of power in Forster to appreciate men and political situations, which was a main cause of his subsequent failure in Ireland. In 1864 his zeal for education obtained gratifying recognition by his being appointed a member of the Royal Commission to inquire into the endowments of Middle Class Schools. In the autumn of 1865 Lord Palmerston died. Lord Russell succeeded as Prime Minister, and Forster accepted the post of Under-Secretary for the Colonies under Mr. Cardwell. The first question he had to deal with in an official though subordinate capacity was the rebellion of the Blacks in Jamaica and the irregular execution of Mr. Gordon. His subsequent defence of the line adopted by Mr. Cardwell in regard to Governor Eyre exposed him to severe criticism. Lord Russell, failing to pass a moderate Reform Bill in the session of 1866, resigned office, and was succeeded by Lord Derby. But Mr. Bright's famous autumn campaign practically carried the concession of Household Suffrage. In 1867 Mr. Disraeli took the "leap in the dark" which "dished the Whigs." The General Election of 1868 brought Mr. Gladstone into power as Prime Minister, and Forster became Vice-President of the Privy Council, or virtual Minister of Education in the new Administration.

No other appointment within his reach could have so fully gratified Forster's ambition. The crying evil of national ignorance continually occupied his thoughts, and no aspiration of his life was more fondly cherished than to open a way to knowledge for every English child by a comprehensive system of public education. For years he had been preparing himself to deal with the question, by reflection and inquiry, by discussion, and by acquiring practical experience in his own school at Burley and the schools of his friend Canon Jackson at Leeds. His chief at the Privy Council Office, Lord Ripon, was an old private and political friend, whose

educational views were in harmony with his own ; and it was with a feeling of patriotic rapture that he found within his grasp the opportunity he had long coveted. We can only touch lightly on the burning question of the Education Act of 1870, but it calls for some notice as the great achievement of Forster's political life, although not, as we think, the severest test of his merits as a statesman. Up to this time education in England had been denominational and voluntary. The Church of England, being by far the most powerful spiritual organization in the kingdom, occupied most of the ground. Forster, however, found three schemes in the field—First, that of the National Education Union, for an extension, by means of increased help from the State, of the existing voluntary system ; second, that of the Birmingham League (to which Nonconformists had lately rallied as tending to promote religious equality), for free, secular, compulsory education, supported altogether by public money ; third, that of Mr. Lowe, a former Vice-President of the Council. Forster adopted and developed the plan of Mr. Lowe. He proposed to use the existing machinery, supplementing it in case of proved inadequacy by compelling the ratepayers of a school district to cover existing needs by erecting new schools ; second, to restrict religious teaching in such new schools to the study of the Bible ; third, to make education compulsory. This last article was modified by the Cabinet ; the others were embodied in a Bill which the Vice-President introduced in the Commons by a speech of remarkable power. At first the measure met with little opposition. But in a few days a storm of disapproval burst forth from the Liberal benches. The Birmingham League had looked on Forster as an exponent of their views, and the instrument of a policy which aimed at the overthrow of the Established Church. Disappointment begot anger, and the bitterest taunts came from old personal and political friends. The full blast of their wrath fell on the Chartist of other days. He was reviled as a trimmer ; as a traitor to his principles for selfish ambition. So furious was the clamour that Mr. Gladstone, absorbed in his Irish Land Bill, hung up the education measure for a time, to allow opinion to grow calm. Subsequently the Government made or accepted certain amendments ; the time-table clause, the Cowper Temple clause, clauses adopting the cumulative vote and the ballot, and increasing grants to denominational schools, which enabled the measure to pass, in principle as Forster framed it, triumphantly through both Houses. Mr. Gladstone showed his appreciation of Forster's work by promoting him to a seat in the Cabinet. But the hatred and distrust of old admirers pursued the author of the Education Act for many years. The Bradford Liberals rewarded him by a vote of censure, and by bitter opposition at the next election.

Mr. Reid, we think, has succeeded in vindicating his hero from the charges of the Birmingham League. Time and widening experience

greatly modified many of Forster's early views. Though originally in favour of secular schools, he had long held the opinion that public education to be beneficial should be based on Christian doctrine. He was opposed to the disestablishment of the Church of England, and, indeed, a member of that party in it of which Mr. Maurice was a leader. He saw neither wisdom nor justice in a design to destroy an educational fabric built up by so much labour and self-sacrifice, which, however incomplete, had effected much good, and was cherished by a majority of the nation. Besides, as a practical politician, he followed the only lines on which his purpose could be accomplished. The Birmingham party, with the aid of household suffrage, barely mustered sixty votes in the Commons. Neither then nor at any time since would England accept a system of purely secular teaching. Judged by its results, the Education Act has been eminently successful, according to the intention of its author, in spreading instruction among the English masses. And Forster seems to have found compensation in the approval of his own conscience, and the conviction of having conferred a great benefit on England, for reproaches that caused him exquisite pain. When Mr. Gladstone retired from public life in 1875, Forster and Lord Hartington were put forward as candidates for the leadership of the Liberal party in the House of Commons. The selection of the latter has been attributed to the anger of the Radicals and the advice of Mr. Bright. But it is not at all clear that Forster was qualified in any high degree for a post which is only a step below the office of Prime Minister. Although his capacity was great, and his love and power of work exceptional, he had not the commanding genius or the splendid oratorical gifts which have enabled men not born to a high social position to win the highest place in English public life. And glaring faults of speech and manner, which exasperated acquaintances as well as strangers, and concealed from those that did not know him well the overflowing kindness of his nature, were a positive disqualification for the leadership of a great party. The disappointment was keen, but he bore it with magnanimity, and gave a cordial, if somewhat independent, support to his successful rival. When Mr. Gladstone came to the front again in the autumn of 1876 to rouse up England against the atrocities of Turkish rule, Forster had gone down the Danube to study the Eastern question on the spot. After his return he joined in vigorously denouncing the Jingo policy of Lord Beaconsfield. About the same time he made his memorable stand against the dictation of the Bradford caucus. His victory over that body had the happy result of healing the breach that separated him from his old Radical supporters. In the General Election of 1880, Mr. Gladstone again carried his party into power, and Forster, unanimously returned by the Liberals of Bradford, accepted the office of Chief Secretary for Ireland, with a seat in the Cabinet. Forster's

warfare with the National party in Ireland is dealt with at large in another article. We shall restrict ourselves here to a very few remarks, suggested by Mr. Reid's narrative. There can be no doubt that he went to Ireland full of ardent sympathy for the Irish people, and with an earnest desire to promote their welfare; that the position he found himself in would have taxed severely very high gifts of statesmanship; that he was misunderstood, misrepresented, and even shamefully calumniated. Neither can there be any doubt that his rule was an absolute failure, and that failure in a great measure resulted from his own shortcomings and mistakes. He does not appear, on assuming the office of Chief Secretary, to have possessed any clear insight into the condition or feeling of the Irish people. And at the very outset he fell into the fatal blunder, inexcusable, and indeed inexplicable, in a man of Forster's independent spirit, broad sympathies, and tolerant views, of refusing to take counsel with their representatives in Parliament. The attitude he adopted towards the Irish members from the first provoked their distrust and hostility. The action of the House of Lords left him powerless in a constitutional struggle. And he found himself confronted by a national organization, which, while defending the peasants from legal wrong, gathered to its standard all the disaffection of the land, and enlisted social passions in a political conflict. His coercive measures, ill-conceived and ill-executed, merely aggravated the situation. He fell under the dominion of a bureaucracy, discredited by origin, evil traditions, and incompetence. Striking wildly at village ruffians, his blows exasperated without being effective. The prisons were crammed with harmless men, who, in spouting frothy rhetoric, had served as safety valves for popular excitement, while murder stalked openly through the land, tracking down its victims with impunity. And when his failure was manifest to all, the mortification of defeat, as well as honest horror of the crimes and outrages the conflict had generated, prevented his recognizing his original error and uniting with his colleagues in an endeavour to repair it. He retired from office, but retirement was so managed as to bring him, quite unnecessarily, into painful collision with Mr. Gladstone, who had always given him a generous support. Henceforth his position in political life was independent and somewhat isolated, leaving him free to discharge the unwelcome office of a "candid friend" towards his former colleagues. This was mainly, however, in the bungled affairs of South Africa and the Soudan, which, in his sympathy for oppressed races and his enthusiastic admiration of General Gordon, he followed with the keenest interest. It is only fair to notice that, although at war to the death with the Parnellite party, his solicitude for what he deemed justice to Ireland did not abate. He was the first among English politicians of the front rank to insist that the concession of household suffrage in 1884

should extend to the sister island. The last great public movement with which his name is associated was that of the Imperial Federation League, of which he was principal founder. Enormous labour during the Session of 1885, as Chairman of the Committee on the Manchester Ship Canal Bill, broke down his iron constitution. At the close of the Session of Parliament he fell into a state of physical languor, from which he never rallied, although he lingered on hopefully to April of the following year. Whatever solace domestic affection, the good wishes of troops of friends in every rank of life, and public solicitude could bring to his closing hours was abundantly given. If he was happy in the period of his entering a public career, he may also be considered happy in the period of its close. His death occurred when he had reached the highest point of his fame in England, as an able, honest, and patriotic statesman; when he had lived down much unjust enmity; and at the very opening of a crisis in the fortunes of his party, which has rent asunder the strongest personal and political ties, and dimmed the lustre of reputations which had seemed to form already a permanent addition to our national glories.

HOME AFFAIRS.

THE normal Session of Parliament closed in strife and tumult such as we have not witnessed since last year. The incidents attending the suspension of Mr. Conybeare, were followed by the exciting struggles on the Charges and Allegations Bill, the record of which are, in the main, the record of the Parliamentary month. The introduction of this unfortunate Bill is responsible for much, and we have not yet fathomed all its possible consequences. The Government have no doubt already repented of it. They are under grave suspicion in regard to it, and if they protest that this is unjust, it is their own fault that suspicion exists. But the Bill has prejudiced them in other ways. When we wrote last month an autumn sitting of Parliament was an open question. Mr. Smith spoke of it, but, in the same breath, hoped it might not be necessary. And as if to make it more unlikely, he began the massacre of his Bills. It is possible that at this period the Government had not made up their minds as to meeting in the autumn. If so, their indecision could not have lasted long. The introduction of the Commission Bill changed everything. The zeal of the House of Commons, which had been quite exemplary from the beginning of the Session—Mr. Goschen admits so much—immediately cooled, and angry contention took its place. The usual result followed. A couple of days were occupied in the second reading of the Commission Bill, though in the end there was no division; four days were given to the committee stage, when the Bill was pushed through by the wholesale use of the closure; finally, a couple of days were devoted to the report stage and third reading. It was on the 8th August only that the Bill passed the Commons. Meanwhile the autumn sitting had become a clear necessity. All the really useful work of the Session had been set aside; and the Government, checked and disappointed, prepared to wind up with all despatch, postponing everything which could be postponed until the return of Parliament. In the final days of the sitting they completed the Local Government Bill, or so much of it as remains, the Railway and Canal Traffic Bill, and two measures for Imperial and National Defence. These, with the National Debt Bill, passed earlier on to give effect to Mr. Goschen's Conversion Scheme, are the solid fruits of six months' Parliamentary work. The Government themselves would hardly care to rank

the Special Commission Bill among the useful legislation of the Session.

Naturally the state of things here set out gives small satisfaction to the Ministerialists and their allies. Mr. Chamberlain, speaking at Highbury the other day, was anxious to put the best face possible upon the achievements of the Government; but he was compelled to make up his brief catalogue of measures by including at least one Bill which has gone over to the autumn. And, as a matter of fact, the list of postponed Bills is much longer than that of Bills already passed. Mr. Smith is blamed as usual, and the story of his forthcoming elevation to the peerage is revived. The Leader of the House is the vicarious victim of a Cabinet much more responsible for the course of events than he. With a crowded paper, the autumn sitting cannot be projected beyond the Christmas holidays—a period of something less than seven weeks. In that time the great bulk of Supply must be taken—nearly a hundred and fifty separate votes—and the Commons will have to deal with the Employers' Liability Act Amendment Bill, the series of Bills on Irish Main Drainage, the Tithes Bills, the Bill for constituting a Board of Agriculture (just introduced), the promised Bill for continuing the operation of Lord Ashbourne's scheme of Land Purchase in Ireland, and Mr. Goschen's Wheel and Van Tax, to say nothing of minor Government measures. Then there are a couple of Bills in the hands of private members, to which so much time has already been given that their failure would be a serious scandal. The Oaths Bill and the Libel Law Amendment Bill have a distinct claim upon the consideration of the Government; and to add to all this, the Irish party propose (very properly, as we think) to discuss a variety of matters which have lately been pushed aside, including the treatment of Mr. Mandeville in Tullamore Gaol. The fact that the Special Commission of Judges will be sitting simultaneously with the House inquiring into the charges against Mr. Parnell and his colleagues, does not give any reason for thinking that matters will be any the easier for the Government, and it is little likely that the autumn Session will fail of full occupation.

Taking Parliamentary events as they occurred, it may be said that the suspension of Mr. Conybeare was a certainty sooner or later. The member for the Camborne Division of Cornwall cares little for public opinion, and still less for Parliamentary tradition. He likes to go his own way in his own fashion, and to call a spade a spade. His sincerity is unquestionable, but his method is sometimes a trial for his party. That he should be unpopular in the House is not surprising, but that the Chair should be influenced by the prevailing feeling against Mr. Conybeare is a thing for which we were not prepared. The acceptance of a motion for closure when the Bann Drainage Bill had been debated for something under half an hour

on the motion for second reading, was admitted by the Speaker to be due to a misapprehension on his part. He explained that he did not see any disposition among "*members from Ireland*" to take part in the debate, and, knowing that they would have other opportunities of dealing with the measure, he allowed the stage to be taken. Now members for Ireland had not rights superior to those of other members even upon Irish Bills, and one cannot but think that Mr. Peel unwittingly allowed the popular notion in the House that Mr. Conybeare is a nuisance, to get the better of him. Nothing, of course, can wholly excuse Mr. Conybeare's letter to the *Star*. It was purposely extremely offensive in tone, and it reiterated the suggestion which had been withdrawn in the House on the previous night, that the Speaker's conduct amounted to "a public scandal," with the unnecessary explanation that the withdrawal was a mere matter of form made to conciliate the Parliamentary proprieties. At the same time Mr. Conybeare was not absolutely devoid of defence. The letter was written in hot blood immediately after the hon. member left the House, and the general admission among the Opposition that it was a breach of privilege, did not prevent Sir George Trevelyan from saying that a moderately worded letter of protest would have been perfectly justifiable in the circumstances. Mr. Morley told the House that he considered the motion for closure in this case "a gross abuse of the Rules;" and this observation, which according to the *Times* was "most reprehensible," was subsequently repeated out of doors. Then the punishment which was proposed for Mr. Conybeare by Lord R. Churchill, who took up the matter, was obviously vindictive. Lord Randolph's intervention in the case was, indeed, altogether indiscreet. He had had a warm encounter with the member for Camborne on the previous night in respect of a matter in which they had rival Bills, and his own side were astonished to hear him propose to suspend Mr. Conybeare for the rest of the Session. In none of the quoted cases did the punishment go beyond a fortnight, and for this the Opposition pleaded with energy. Lord Randolph loftily refused to give way, and it was only when Mr. Smith declared that he would add to the motion words limiting the suspension to a month if the Session lasted longer, that the matter was arranged in this sense in the absence of the Opposition, who refused to sanction what they considered a vindictive punishment. Mr. Conybeare's expulsion was still in force when the House rose on the 13th ult. In the meantime he had been in Cornwall consulting his constituents, and, if we may believe common report, he had found that his conduct was not altogether approved by his friends. Mr. Conybeare may possibly take warning from the fact, and if, as a consequence, he improves his Parliamentary style it will be a distinct gain to himself and a relief to his party.

The Special Commission Bill, more accurately known as the Charges

and Allegations (Members of Parliament) Bill, produced a number of exciting incidents in its course through the House of Commons. At the outset and subsequently Government were repeatedly asked to explain why they had extended the scope of the Bill—beyond the terms in which Mr. Smith first made the offer of the Commission—to “other persons” besides the members of Parliament charged by the *Times*. And Mr. Parnell, who followed Mr. Smith on the motion for the second reading, protested against any attempt to turn attention from the acts of himself and his Parliamentary colleagues to the doings of the Land League. He suggested that the change of front had been made either on the suggestion of the Attorney-General (who was counsel for the *Times* in the O'Donnell v. Walter case) or of Mr. Walter himself, and declared that the desire of the Government was to cast discredit upon a great national movement, and to provide a means of escape for their “confederates” from charges which had already broken down. This attitude Mr. Parnell steadily maintained to the end. But he also went further. “If,” he said, “the inquiry were directed to the authenticity of the letters read by the Attorney-General in the O'Donnell case he could demonstrate within a week that they were forgeries.” He had dealt with these letters at length on a previous occasion, and he now took up certain other allegations made against him by the Attorney-General as counsel for the *Times*, to show how the *Times* had blundered concerning his doings in Paris and elsewhere. And then he formulated his demands upon the Treasury bench as follow:—That the inquiry should be limited to members of Parliament according to the offer first made; that the persons charged should be specifically named; that it should be a judicial inquiry; that the accused should have the right to open the case, and to conduct it as a case in the Courts; that the charges should be specified; and that all documents should be submitted to the accused at the outset, in order that they might take photographs and be in a position to submit them to the examination of experts.

It was upon these lines that the Opposition acted in their attempts to deal with the Commission Bill. Mr. Gladstone warmly supported Mr. Parnell in making his demands, and there was all through the utmost harmony between the two sections of the Opposition. *Per contra* the Liberal Unionists co-operated as thoroughly with the Government. Mr. Chamberlain was for going into everything done in connection with the Land League, save the minor and admitted offences of boycotting and intimidation; but he proposed that the Government should relieve the innocent party of the costs of the inquiry. Very early in the debate the Home Secretary admitted that the Land League, as a League, was more closely concerned in this investigation than its individual members, and this contention, spite of the fact that it was quite inconsistent with Mr. Smith's first offer of a Commission “in

order that certain members of the House might have an opportunity of clearing their characters," was more and more pushed to the front as the suspicion grew on the Ministerial benches that the *Times* had perhaps been misled in regard to the letters.

The four days' debate in committee was wholly occupied in attempts to amend Clause 1. Not a single point was conceded by the Government, but, at the end of the third day, notice was given of a resolution for next day ordering the Chairman to put the clauses *seriatim*, and without further debate, at the end of that sitting. Previously Mr. Smith had proposed the names of the Commissioners separately, and Mr. Justice Hannen and Mr. Justice Smith, one a Liberal Unionist, the other a Tory, were unquestioningly adopted. On the other hand, there was a fierce controversy over the name of Mr. Justice Day. The learned judge is a Catholic, and an English Catholic; which means that he is in all probability a bitter opponent of the Irish claims. Mr. Labouchere unearthed some indiscreet words of the Judge at Liverpool Assizes in sentencing certain Irishmen for a shameful outrage, and Mr. John Morley created quite a tempest in the bosom of Mr. Goschen, by reading a letter from Mr. R. Adams, an Irish barrister who served on the Belfast Commission with Mr. Justice Day, to the effect that the learned Judge "nightly railed against Parnell and his friends, and believed them guilty of any crime." Of course Mr. Justice Day's name was carried, and it may be said here that, just before the House rose, Mr. Smith read a letter forwarded to him by Mr. Morley from Sir E. Bulwer, another of the Belfast Commissioners, in which it was stated that while in the North of Ireland Mr. Justice Day made no reference to the existing political situation, and seemed to have no party attachments.

Mr. Parnell's attack on Mr. Chamberlain came as a surprise to the Committee. It appeared to be due to certain allusions to their friendship previously made by Mr. Chamberlain, and to a somewhat patronizing suggestion that he really did not accept the *Times*' charges as proved. These sent Mr. Parnell into certain recollections of his own, which he said were mainly to the effect that Mr. Chamberlain was always willing to put up the Irish party to do work he would not undertake himself, and that he was frequently guilty of betraying the counsels and plans of his colleagues in the Cabinet. It was in the excitement engendered by this attack that Mr. T. P. O'Connor fell into difficulty by calling the member for West Birmingham, "Judas Chamberlain." The right hon. gentleman thought the insult sufficiently important to bring it before the Speaker, and it was promptly withdrawn with such apology as satisfied the Chair, though the terms of apology could hardly have mollified Mr. Chamberlain. It was not until next day that Mr. Chamberlain found opportunity of replying to Mr. Parnell, and he then told us, among other things, that the scheme of National Councils about

which so much was heard in 1885, was not his scheme, but was sent to him by Mr. Parnell in Mr. Parnell's own hand. It did not satisfy Mr. Chamberlain's Radicalism, but it was submitted to Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet as a scheme which would satisfy the Irish leaders. All previous communications of any sort with Mr. Parnell were, in like fashion, made known to Mr. Gladstone and the Irish Secretary for the time being as the Ministers principally concerned—*ergo* there could be no betrayal of the Cabinet as had been suggested. Mr. Chamberlain professed a perfect readiness to satisfy the public on all these matters, if Mr. Parnell on his part were willing. In a second speech the member for Cork enlarged the scope of his allegations, and outside the House Captain O'Shea came forward to support Mr. Chamberlain with a letter to the *Times*. It was here suggested that not only had Mr. Chamberlain Mr. Parnell's scheme of National Councils, but Mr. Parnell's "own Coercion Bill," which latter was to have been passed in 1885 "with just enough show of opposition by the Irish party to satisfy the Extremists in Ireland and America." The quarrel being thus transferred to the Press, remained there. When it was thought that Mr. Chamberlain had "scored," Mr. Parnell challenged him to the production of his proofs, and things became very interesting. In recollection of the *Times*' letters, one wanted to see what sort of man Mr. Parnell was in private correspondence. Mr. Chamberlain accepted the challenge, but delayed a full statement for several days. When it appeared, it was universally admitted to have missed fire. He had talked of proofs in Mr. Parnell's own handwriting, but the National Councils scheme bore the name of Mr. O'Shea, and Mr. Parnell's "own Coercion Bill" was described as a copy of the Act of 1882 with certain passages through which a pen had been drawn. There was nowhere a scrap of Mr. Parnell's handwriting of any sort, and for all the "proof" given, Mr. O'Shea might be responsible for the whole.

At this point the quarrel stands, and Mr. Parnell naturally finds no call upon him to make rejoinder. His reputation for extreme care and caution in all political matters has been amply justified, and this gives his friends confidence that his repeated declarations concerning the *Times*' letters may be relied on. It ought perhaps to be added that Mr. Chamberlain has himself very frankly admitted Mr. Parnell's accuracy concerning the National Council scheme, and it is now established, by the consent of Mr. Parnell's opponent, that the Irish leader never agreed to accept a National Council as a substitute for an Irish Parliament. What he and his friends were willing to take from English statesmen, pending the extension of the franchise, and the creation of a strong Irish Parliamentary party, was a Central Board to take over the duties of the various administrative *bureaux* in Dublin. But it was explicitly stipulated that this Board should have no legislative functions whatever. Mr. Chamberlain would have added certain legislative powers, and for this reason his scheme

was derided, to his extreme annoyance, as we know. And when the Tories came in, and Lord Carnarvon began to whisper of hopes of an Irish Parliament, the Irish party, then nearly ninety strong, threw the scheme of a Central Board to the winds.

To return to the incidents of the Commission Bill, it is necessary to notice how, after four or five days—in which the Government carefully abstained from saying anything to the oft-repeated suggestion that they had been in communication with the *Times* upon the drafting of the Bill—Mr. W. H. Smith was goaded into an admission that Mr. Walter (the chief proprietor of the *Times*) had called upon him at his house. Mr. Walter was “an old friend,” and, though he mentioned the Bill, we were asked to believe that he made no attempt whatever to influence Mr. Smith in any direction. The Bill was, in fact, in print at the time, and contained the words “and others,” to which so much objection had been taken. It is a pity that Mr. Smith, having gone so far, did not say more as to the nature of his conversation with Mr. Walter. With every desire to believe in his *bonâ fides*, one cannot but wonder that he should have seen Mr. Walter in the circumstances, and why, having so seen him, the fact was not stated earlier to the House of Commons. As the matter stands, with the refusal of Mr. Smith to go into details upon his conversation with his “old friend,” there is a suspicious look about the whole thing, and this is not decreased when we remember that the Attorney-General was also in council with the Cabinet about the same time.

The irritation into which the *Times* was thrown by the pertinacity of Parliamentary inquiry on these matters was natural enough if it was not wise. When Mr. Morley took upon himself to champion Mr. Redmond's ancient grievance against the anti-Irish journal, which he conditionally branded with “infamy,” the *Times* lost its head and fell foul of its critics with a reckless violence which brought it into an admitted breach of privilege. Mr. Labouchere promptly brought it to book by a declaratory motion which, if adopted, must have been followed by severe punishment. But Mr. Goschen, as temporary leader of the House, begged the House, according to precedents conveniently turned up, to overlook the offence of the *Times*, and Mr. Gladstone, adding his voice to this appeal, the motion was withdrawn, not, however, before Mr. Redmond had re-stated his complaint against the *Times*, and Mr. Morley, throwing aside his qualifying language, had, “as an experienced journalist,” deliberately declared the leading organ to be covered with “the deepest infamy.” The *Times* has since attempted an explanation of its treatment of Mr. Redmond, which leaves much to be desired, and having professed a willingness to do him strict justice, has at the same time encouraged its own correspondents to bring against him afresh the accusations which he has time after time demolished, without, however, getting the *Times* to publish his denials.

It had been expected that the attempt to drive the Commission Bill through the committee stage by the closure, would produce trouble. But this was not so. A strong protest was made against the adoption of Mr. Goschen's resolution ordering the Chairman to "report" the Bill at a certain hour, but when the hour came, the Irish members contented themselves with abstaining. On the report stage, proceedings were more amicable, for the reason that the Government showed themselves a little more reasonable. They accepted various small amendments, compelling attendance before the Commission of unwilling witnesses, keeping alive the penalties for defaulters, and ordering the Commission to report to the House from time to time "if they think fit." It was also arranged (thanks to Mr. Courtney) that any member of Parliament in an Irish prison should have an opportunity of meeting any charges made against him before the Commission, and a discretionary power was given to the Commissioners to enable and compel the inspection and production of documents. The third reading of the Bill was opposed, not by the Irish members, but by Sir W. Lawson and Mr. Labouchere, and of course quite uselessly. Still the protest against what Mr. Labouchere wittily dubbed the "*Times*' Protection Bill" was not without its value as emphasizing the leading objections taken against the Bill, and as exhibiting the absurdly partisan action of the Government in standing so carefully all through for the *Times* newspaper.

Of the success of the Bill in the Lords there could be no manner of doubt, but Lord Herschell's weighty speech, which put the objections of the Opposition with great force and cogency, remained altogether unanswered. Within a few hours of the Bill having received the Royal assent, the Commissioners met to settle the preliminaries. Their action was no doubt influenced by the news that Mr. Parnell had begun a suit for libel against the *Times* in the Scotch Court of Session. This movement of the Irish leader became possible the moment the Government refused to limit the inquiry by Commission, and it had been plainly hinted at in the Home Rule Press. The *Times* has given us to understand that it will do nothing to advance the hearing of the suit, which it regards as a trick meant to oust the jurisdiction of the Special Commission. This means of course that the *Times* will do all it can to retard the hearing, and it is unlikely that the case will come to trial before next year. Meantime, the Special Commission, which is to begin its inquiry on the 16th of October (after a preliminary meeting on the 17th of September), will have done a considerable share of its work. In Scotch legal circles there is much discussion whether the Court of Session will undertake the trial of a suit between "foreigners" who have no property in the country.

Local Government Bill saw little change in its final stages.

On the report stage, Mr. Ritchie had the insertion of a new plan for distributing the poor rate duty to the county authorities. Previously the proposed basis of distribution was the number of indoor poor in the workhouses, but the money is now to be divided in proportion to the grants in aid of local taxation which each county received in the year ending 31st March last. A strong Commission, with Lord Derby as president, was appointed to arrange the financial questions between the towns made counties in themselves, and the counties proper. When the Bill went up to the Lords, the Earl of Carnarvon wept over it as a revolutionary scheme for introducing the wire-puller and the caucus into the guileless country districts, but otherwise it was astonishing to see how quietly the peers took their practical dethronement. The changes made in the Bill were few. Lord Salisbury succeeded in giving the peers the voting qualification for the county councils, and if he had had his way, he would have qualified the sons of peers and the sons of county electors. But these last things were forbidden to him and he surrendered. He had the help of Lord Herschell in reserving the rights of the magistracy as conservators of the peace, and in giving them, to this extent, power over the police; and the Tories rallied round the Prime Minister in order to give back to the Corporation of London the power of appointing its own Recorder. This was, no doubt, in order to allow Lord Salisbury to say at the Mansion House banquet, which followed, that Ministers had solved the difficult problem of metropolitan government without diminishing in any way the lustre with which the City shone in the eye of the Foreigner! Want of time prevented any serious controversy over these amendments when the Bill went back to the Commons; but in any case the Government would have prevailed. Sir Henry James, alone among the Unionists, protested against the continuation of an elective Recordership, knowing of course that the stipulation that the Crown must approve the City nominee before he performs any judicial functions will be mere matter of form.

In Ireland the situation has not made much movement. Mr. Balfour has arrested another member of Parliament, Mr. J. O'Kelly, who was seized in London under an Irish warrant backed by a Bow Street magistrate, and has since been sentenced to four months' imprisonment for advising the people of Roscommon to treat the Star Chamber courts with contempt. Mr. O'Kelly has given notice of appeal, and is at liberty meanwhile. The Court of Exchequer has refused to release Mr. Dillon, whose case was argued on the presumption that he was not legally in custody; but the release of Mr. Latchford, a Kerry magistrate, sentenced to a month's imprisonment for "riot," has been ordered on the ground that the offence was not sufficiently specified in the conviction. This is probably equal to saying that there was no case against the accused, but Mr. Balfour

and his law-officers cheerfully maintain that it is possible for one man to be guilty of "riot." Apart from the doubt as to the character of the evidence, Mr. Morley has called attention to certain things in connection with the case which, to say the least, are not a little suspicious. The case was dealt with, not under the ordinary law, but under the Crimes Act, and the magistrate who heard it (Mr. Cecil Roche) had previously been publicly censured by Mr. Latchford, who had also joined in a petition to the Lord Chancellor for his removal. These facts are undisputed, and so far no sufficient explanation has been given concerning them. Mr. Balfour has satisfied himself, and that of course is enough. Yet this does not altogether remove the suspicion that the law has been strained to punish a personal enemy. The Coroner's inquiries into the death of Mr. Mandeville and of Dr. Ridley have resulted awkwardly for the Government. In the first case the verdict was to the effect that deceased died from cellular inflammation of the throat, brought about by brutal and unjustifiable treatment in prison, and the jury protested against the cruel treatment dealt out to political offenders. As to Dr. Ridley, the jury found that he committed suicide "whilst under temporary insanity, produced by the apprehension of disclosures at the previous inquest," *which might injure him with the Executive Government.* This we take to be the unexpressed meaning of the verdict, for it was further declared "that he was compelled to act in his official capacity in contravention of his own humane and considerate views." Again the jury condemned "the reckless and unfounded charges made by Dr. Barr" against certain of the medical witnesses and "poor Mrs. Mandeville." This of course is so much waste paper for Mr. Balfour, but we commend to public attention the evidence of Dr. Barr, the Government surgeon, as illustrating the temper in which affairs are conducted in Ireland. This gentleman, who seems to be a practitioner of no particular eminence at Liverpool, took it upon himself to pass sweeping condemnations upon the Irish doctors who visited Tullamore, and whose diplomas were some of them higher than his own. He admitted in the first inquest that he might have said Mr. Mandeville was a scoundrel who deserved all he got, and his conduct throughout both inquiries was such as to show how carefully he had copied the spirit and manners of those who are now responsible for the government of the unhappy sister country. It is not possible to pursue the subject of these inquiries in any detail, but the experiences of Mr. William O'Brien, Mr. Alderman Hooper, and Mr. Lane—all members of Parliament, who have been in Tullamore—will remain with the Irish people as a bitter memory for many a long day. Meanwhile the game of eviction goes on, and we have no signs of the Arrears Bill demanded by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. It is not surprising in the circumstances that we hear nothing of the Papal Decree.

According to Mr. Morley, it has not been read from a single altar in Ireland; even the Bishop of Limerick says nothing more of it. The solidarity of priests and people remains complete, and Mr. Balfour deludes himself with thinking that he is solving the Irish question. Was there ever such fatuity? One sensible thing the Chief Secretary has done during the month. Being compelled to abandon his scheme for equipping the County Courts to deal with applications for fair rents, he has now appointed ten additional assistant Land Commissioners to work on existing lines. It is consequently hoped that we may soon see a reduction of the vast arrears of work in the Land Courts.

The Mansion House banquet to Ministers was remarkable only for Lord Salisbury's singularly strange speech on foreign affairs. If the Prime Minister thinks that German policy in Bulgaria is identical with his own, he must have read a different version of Bismarck's great speech in the Reichstag to that which was vouchsafed to the public. Or is it that he has secretly come into line with the German Chancellor? This last would be "glad tidings" indeed, and one would forgive much to the Minister who had the courage thus to dissociate himself from his vicious past. The naval manœuvres have been somewhat of a sham. Taking the view of the naval alarmists, they have shown that our mercantile harbours and coast towns, to go no further, are at the mercy of a daring enemy, and that if we were at war with a strong naval power, nothing would be easier than to baffle and paralyze the British fleet. Now we are not prepared to subscribe to anything of the sort. It is too great a strain upon our credulity. Without going so far as Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, who seems to think that the raidings of Admiral Tryon were in part arranged so as to revive the waning agitation of the naval "reformers," it is pretty certain that everything favoured the success of "the enemy." In one case only was anything attempted from the shore to give check to Admiral Tryon's cruisers. Our coast defences are poor enough, but they do exist, and in case of war they would find rapid and enormous extension. Moreover, it is to be presumed there would be troops of some sort at the vulnerable points of the coast, and it is more than probable that the British squadrons would not wander about the Downs waiting an attack upon the Thames, which, if we may believe the correspondent of the *Standard*, was from the first strictly forbidden. To draw conclusions from the recent operations is foolish self-deception. The only thing which can be gained from such manœuvres is a very limited test of men and material. It may be allowed that the former are as good as ever, if they were not hopelessly handicapped by disgraceful administration. As to the ships, the story is bad—very bad. Hardly one of them has come through without one or more breakdowns. If the machinery

put into our battle-ships were put into our Atlantic liners, the company which had such ships would be bankrupt in a month. Nothing more disgraceful has been witnessed than the failure of our new cruisers. These vessels, specially designed for speed, ought to compare in some sort with merchantmen of the *Etruria* and *Umbria* type, but it is difficult to see where or how the comparison can really be made. In fact, the thing is impossible on the face of it. If we are to have more cruisers as the result of the manœuvres, most people will surely cry out for cruisers which are not an abominable imposture and which will do their guaranteed speed when the coal bunkers are full as well as when they are running low.

The Encyclical Letter of the Bishops who attended the recent Lambeth Conference is an interesting document, about which a good deal might be said, but it is sufficient to note here how the Anglican Church is being influenced by the spirit of the time. There is a liberality and a large-hearted charity about the letter, the like of which has never before been found in a Lambeth Encyclical. That it should have been proposed to "recognize" Nonconformist ministers as co-workers in the same field, spite of the "irregularity" of their ordination, is, whatever else we may think of it, a remarkable proof of advance in the path of toleration and brotherly kindness. The prelates were, in fact, so deeply moved by this spirit that they had not a word to say in respect of that polemical theology which is the delight of the Bishop of Liverpool. His lordship is still intent on "putting down the Ritualists," and he complains that Churchmen like himself have found no encouragement in the Encyclical. To most people this will perhaps be the precise reason why they can read the Encyclical without irritation.

The month of August 1888 will be notable in the history of railway travelling. A Great Northern express has made the journey from London to Edinburgh in 7 hours 32 minutes, including three stoppages, amounting in the aggregate to 43 minutes. The distance is just under 400 miles. The North-Western Company in competition have never completed the journey under 7 hours 38 minutes, with a much lighter train: but their *route* is four miles longer, and they have to climb Shap Fell, nearly 1000 feet above sea-level.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by men of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

UNITED AUSTRALIA AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

Introduction—It is generally admitted, both in Great Britain and in her possessions beyond the seas, that the consolidation of the Empire by some form of Imperial Federation is advisable. Allowing this to be so, I shall endeavour eventually to point out the advantages I think would accrue, but first to inquire how far the late and present policy of the Imperial Government satisfies or fails to satisfy those British dependencies which are rapidly developing into nationalities themselves. The subject I am endeavouring to treat is of such vast importance, and surrounded by difficulties so many though not insuperable, that I shall now only deal with the most remote but not the least of England's possessions—the colonies within the continent of Australia.

These colonies have been prominently brought into notice of late years by the appointment of accredited Agents-General in London, by the twenty years' work of the Royal Colonial Institute, by the formation of the Imperial Federation League, by the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, by the late Colonial Conference, and by the action taken by men of mark who have visited these lands, and have on their return added their testimony to their growing importance.

The Exhibition now being held at Melbourne will be the means of disseminating much information, and it is opportune for me to suggest to its visitors the reflection that fifty-three years ago the only Europeans in the present colony of Victoria were the Henty

Brothers, who were engaged in whaling and squatting in Portland Bay; and John Batman, who ascended the Yarra, moored his thirty-ton schooner to a gum-tree, and pitched his tent where now stands the city of Melbourne.

What Victoria has become during this period may well make us reflect, What will the future of Australia be? Its greatness was predicted by Sir Henry Parkes at the celebration of the Australian centenary, lately held at Sydney, and his predictions are well justified by the character of the inhabitants. Since the discovery of Australia by Captain Cook and its earliest settlement, those who are conversant with its rise and progress find that the British race transplanted to the southern hemisphere have lost none of the qualities that have made the British nation great. In the many explorers and pioneers who founded that great country, we find strongly marked the same love of adventure, research, and enterprise that distinguished Englishmen in the days of Queen Elizabeth. As settlement and civilization advance, important measures require treatment, and prompt action is rendered necessary; and herein we find displayed the same grit and backbone by which our forefathers earned glory for themselves and for their country. When Sir Edward Strickland suggested that a contingent be sent to Suakin, and Mr. Dalley responded by prompt action, they were guided by the same influences which led Gordon to the Soudan. When Sir Thomas McLlwraith sent a police magistrate and a constable to take possession of New Guinea in the name of the Queen, colonists were reminded of the traditional exploits of Drake and Raleigh. Furthermore, late events have proved beyond doubt the loyalty and sympathy of the Australians towards the mother country, and this has been displayed by many further expressions of attachment.

We have endeavoured to show that the colonists are imbued with energy, self-reliance, and loyalty. Keeping these characteristics before us, we may be better able to judge whether the policy of the Home Government is likely to strengthen and maintain the bonds of sympathy with the colonists, and eventually to pave the way for the consolidation of the Empire; and we feel prepared to criticize England's policy towards her Australian colonies, and to adduce sufficient evidence in support of every proposition we advance.

Deportation of French Criminals to the South Pacific.—Several years ago the colonists grew alarmed when it became known that the French Government began the deportation of *récidivistes* to the South Pacific. Petitions and requests were sent, urgently requesting the Home Government to use their good offices in remonstrating against the continuance of so great an evil. We know that representations were made to the French Government, but they seem to have had no effect, since quite recently shipments of convicts were sent to New Caledonia. Thereupon the Federal Council sitting at

Hobart sent a petition to the Queen, from which I quote the following:—

"We admit the undoubted sovereign right of any country to use its own territory as it pleases, subject, however, to the qualifications equally good in private and international law, that it does not constitute a menace and evil to its neighbours. We believe that if the shores of England were subjected to similar danger and contamination the Imperial Government would make representations that it would not be possible for any foreign Power year after year to disregard. We would humbly submit to your Majesty that if the representations of your Australian colonies remain without effect, measures for self-defence will be necessarily forced upon them, which they regret to have to direct against any Power in friendship with your Majesty, but which they have no doubt, in the exceptional circumstances set forth, would receive your Majesty's ready sanction."

The French convicts sent to the South Pacific are of the very worst type, and they had barely reached their new penal home when Australia (but Queensland particularly, from her geographical position) began to feel the effects of the dreadful scourge of their presence. Her expenditure was increased, as she had to watch her shores, to intercept and secure the boatloads which were continually landing. If so many have reached that colony, how many more may have landed on those islands whose inhabitants are aboriginals only. Colonists think that under such special circumstances the Home Government, by making a strong remonstrance, could have induced the French Government to discontinue sending its worst criminals to the South Pacific.

New Guinea.—Again, we are under the impression that a great blunder has been committed with reference to New Guinea, for subsequent events leave us not free from humiliation. The Premier of the colony of Queensland, for obvious reasons, took formal possession of unoccupied land in New Guinea in the name of the Queen, subject, however, to ratification by her Majesty's Government. We think he was justified in doing so, if for no other reasons than the bitter experiences gained from the use the French nation have made of their possessions which are but too close to Queensland. Colonists watched with anxiety what steps the Imperial Government would take under these circumstances. They naturally thought that such a bold stroke of far-sighted policy would at least have been appreciated. But, when the Under-Secretary announced in the House of Commons that the Queensland Government had taken possession of New Guinea in the name of the Queen, pending the decision of the Home Government, many members in the House were greatly annoyed, and put pressure upon the Government to induce it to repudiate the annexation, or, in other words, to haul down the flag of England. They naturally thought that the "many members" who swayed the Government in this case constituted a majority representative of the feeling of the country, and that England's policy was

to acquire no more territory, showing rather an indifference to protect what she already possessed. Had the Imperial Government absolutely declined to endorse the action of Queensland, there the matter would at least have rested. But their vacillating policy encouraged another Power to step in and take possession of nearly one-half of what was, or should have been, British territory.¹ The Rev. James Chalmers, in a paper read at the Royal Colonial Institute, described the continent of New Guinea to be in shape like a dromedary. I think an emu is a better illustration. However, by looking at the map of New Guinea we find the Dutch possess the head, neck, and breast; the Germans appropriate the back and loins; while the British lion tardily accepts what is left, the abdomen and tail.

Englishmen abroad seem to realize more keenly how much Britain's safety in the past depended upon her natural ocean boundary, and Australians feel its importance in their island home. The partition of New Guinea into three, leaves boundary lines whose indistinctness may at any time lead to dispute, and no importance seems to have been attached to their demarcation, although past experiences, in all parts of the world, prove that our greatest troubles have arisen from imaginary frontier lines not defined by natural boundaries. This is apparent by our dubious settlement upon our Indian frontier, and in our Cape colonies. Moreover, I consider that the greatest calamity that can befall a native race is to have more than one European Power to govern it.

North Queensland — Passing on from the unpalatable topic of New Guinea, I now enter upon a subject fraught with the greatest importance. It also concerns the scheme I am venturing to suggest for Australian confederation, without which Imperial unity is not likely to be established, at least so far as British possessions in the South Pacific are concerned. I allude to a petition for the division of the colony of Queensland, which was presented to her Majesty, through the Colonial Office, signed by 10,000 of the male adults residing in the northern portion of that colony. The Separation League of North Queensland sent delegates to plead their cause at the Colonial Office. Their petition was refused, and no encouragement was given to them unless they complied with two conditions, one of which was an impossibility, and the other couched in such ambiguous terms that it might mean anything. This petition came from the majority of the male adults of what is known as North Queensland, from men who have developed its resources, created its trade, and brought it to such importance that it is absolutely necessary for its beneficial administration that they should be allowed to frame its laws. I therefore think the petition should have received more con-

¹ The imminence of this danger has been repeatedly pressed upon H.M. Government by the Council of the Royal Colonial Institute since the year 1875.

sideration. The Secretary of State, replying to the Separation delegates, said that while the Home Government had the power to create a new colony, that power was latent, and it was unadvisable to exercise it, unless a motion approving of separation were passed by the Queensland Legislature, or an overwhelming case made out to justify such interference. That the Legislature of Queensland, as it now is, would pass a motion for the division of the colony is absurd: "for we have no instance on record where a Colonial Parliament has voluntarily surrendered a part of its territory. The separation of Victoria and Queensland from New South Wales was opposed most bitterly to the end by its Governor and Legislature."¹ Colonists think the petitioners proved that theirs was "an overwhelming case," by showing the grounds on which separation was most desirable, supporting their arguments by statistical returns. "In doing so," continues Mr. Coote, "they were only asking for the fulfilment of promises held out and sanctioned by Imperial law. The question was not one on which they would have to rely on the present Brisbane Government, as to whether they would permit a division of the colony, but one that called for adjustment by the Home Government in an equitable manner. In presenting their petition, their faith and reliance were supported by provisions specially made by an Imperial Act of Parliament, which provided for further separation, and for division of the great continent of Australia as it became populated and of sufficient importance."

The late Duke of Newcastle, considered one of the ablest Secretaries of State for the Colonies who ever sat in the Colonial Office, in writing, August 18, 1859, to Sir W. Denison, Governor-General of the Australian Colonies, after the issue of the letters patent to the new colony, remarks: "It will be advisable that the Crown should possess the power of subdividing further the territory now created into the colony of Queensland, by detaching from it such northern portions as may hereafter be found fit to be erected into separate colonies."

His Grace was convinced that further divisions would be necessary, for he warned Sir George Bowen, on the 11th December 1861, with reference to the annexation of some acquired territory to Queensland.

I think that the petitioners justified their action by showing that the land over which they asked permission to legislate has an area of 280,000 square miles, with a seaboard of 1500 miles, containing a population of 80,000, with an accumulative trade of £3,800,000 per annum, importing goods to the value of £2,000,000, and exporting products to the value of £1,800,000, annually. Its progress is extraordinary, for barely twenty-six years ago this portion of Australia was unknown. In our Colonial policy we should be very much guided by the past results of separation—

¹ Mr. W. Coote on Separation.

for instance, that of Victoria and Queensland from New South Wales, so far attended with the best of results. As it has been truly observed, no statesman in our day can afford to overlook experiences which are matters of history.

In refusing to accede to the petition presented, the Secretary of State was probably influenced by the presence of Queensland's Premier, Sir S. W. Griffiths, who no doubt personally renewed his promise which appeared in the Governor's speech, delivered on the prorogation of Parliament:—"That the (Queensland) Ministry would during the recess prepare measures to remove as far as practicable the evils of undue centralization in the administration of the government, and to provide for the speedy and economical expenditure in the several divisions of the colony, of the revenue raised within them. . . . If to this be added an extension of the existing powers of local government," it was believed that the evils of which the north complained would be "effectually removed."

The panacea to satisfy the north has been proposed in a decentralization scheme. So far it has been an utter failure; it was obnoxious to the south, ignored by the north, and it led to the resignation of Sir S. W. Griffiths' ablest colleague, the Hon. the Colonial Treasurer, who, when the Bill was brought before the House, said: "The details of that measure are obnoxious to me, and to those whom I consider even more competent judges. . . . I would prefer giving my vote for territorial separation, than for the passage of the proposed measure."

There is no doubt separation must eventually take place; the country is ripe for it, the inhabitants demand it, and mean to have it. We hope that the Imperial Government will graciously consider the claim when renewed, and grant it, as being not only politic but just—politic, as regards the Empire; just, because the freedom asked is merited.

I endorse the petition from the people of North Queensland for territorial separation. The immense territory of Queensland needs division into two colonies, for, having the confederation of the whole of Australia in view, it is all-important to endeavour to place each colony on as equal a footing as possible. Australian history forces one to believe that smaller areas than now exist are more favourable to a high social development. The separation cause is slumbering now, but will awake with renewed vigour, and it is to be hoped that the question will be settled before rancour and ill-feeling grow between those who are now upon good terms.

The northerners urge, and with great justice, that the present colony of Queensland is too large to be judiciously governed from a remote corner of the south; that, since from geographical and other influences the majority of the community dwell in the south, the voice of the north in all legislative measures will remain unheeded;

that under the present régime there are many laws suitable for the southern portion of Queensland which are unfitted for the northern. They are alarmed at the increasing magnitude of the national debt, principally expended in unnecessary unproductive works in the south, the price paid for favour and power. Moreover, they say, "we came and formed our homes here, where we found a waste; by our patience and work we have improved our condition; we have developed the country's resources, until Northern Queensland has attained a position, and is at the present time superior to Port Philip, now Victoria, or to Moreton Bay, now Queensland, at the time when the British Government granted a request similar to the one we now make."

Their petition will be renewed, and well may they urge: "We have by practice gained experience; we have served our apprenticeship; we have attained our majority; and as men we have asked the mother country to treat us as men."

Defence.—A very important question at the present time is the defence of our colonies. I treat here the defences of Australia only. There is no doubt that each colony will pay its fair share, but Australians think the British Government shrink from their responsibility.¹ The British taxpayers cannot object to protect their own property. In 1882 a conference, at which all the colonies were represented, met in Sydney, and resolved that the land defences of the country ought to be undertaken by themselves, and the naval defence by Great Britain. "It must not be forgotten that whilst the colonies are defending their respective territories they are protecting British interests, whose property to the extent of £300,000,000 is owned by people residing in Great Britain, and who from the peculiar colonial taxation do not contribute to that defence; and although the colonies are paying their tribute for the use of this capital by way of interest amounting to £14,000,000 annually, when it reaches England it is subject to the usual income-tax." Moreover, "90 per cent. of the shipping trading in those seas belong to British owners, the vessels of the P. & O. Co., the Orient Co., the British India Co., the A.U.S.N. Co., and others. If the same British shipping was on the coast of any country in the world, not connected at all with Great Britain, except in trade, she would have a fleet in the neighbourhood for its protection."²

Colonists are particularly alive to the importance of maintaining the efficiency of the British fleet; they feel that England's safety and their own depends upon our maintaining the sovereignty of the seas. If the British fleet in time of war could not protect and keep

¹ Since writing the above I notice with great satisfaction that the Imperial and Colonial Governments, with the exception of Queensland, have jointly agreed to strengthen the fleet on the Australian station.

² Sir Thomas Mellwraith's Manifesto, 1888.

up her food supply, what a dire calamity would follow—famine, worse than invasion for her, and defencelessness for her colonies!

I have so far endeavoured to show that grounds for complaint on the part of Australia do exist. I am forced to bring forward one more instance in which England has not met colonial advances in a spirit of friendliness, or even of respect for the traditional qualities of the British character.

Antarctic Exploration.—The following request was lately made to the Imperial Government: Sir Graham Berry, acting on behalf of the Australian colonies, represented to the Home Government the desirability of a preliminary expedition to cruise round the fringe of the Antarctic Seas, with a view to pave the way for a more thorough research later on. The colonies offered to subscribe £5000 towards the expedition, if the Home Government would contribute a similar sum. The modest request was strongly supported by the Colonial Office, as well as by the Royal Colonial Institute (which first took action amongst the learned societies of London), the Royal and the Royal Geographical Societies. The Treasury, however, refused to place any such sum upon the estimates. Presumably, British taxpayers would object to such a sum being granted unless they could first hear the jingle of coin, returnable with interest added. The colonists take a different view of this national economy. They think the estimates might be clipped, but not at the loss of national honour, and that no discouragement should be given at home or abroad to damp that old sea spirit which made England great—England whose ships are said to bear four-fifths of the carrying trade of the world. Would £5000 have been ill spent, if only to uphold the noble traditions of our nation? Such a refusal rings too much of national worldliness. It is to be hoped that Australia unaided will send an expedition to the Polar Sea, for she would think it humiliating if other nations made discoveries, while her own race had not attempted to keep up its prestige upon its native element.¹

State Emigration.—We might well have expected joint action in this instance, and still more desirable for both parties would it be if Britain would join with Australia in a matter of greater importance—namely, emigration under State auspices.

I quote an extract from a speech by the Bishop of Manchester, at a meeting in that city upon State Colonization:—

“Here was a country (Australia) that had abundant resources undeveloped and wanted labourers. Over the sea here was another country full of capital that could not find profitable investment, full of labourers who could barely get bread—resources on one side, and labourers on another, were obliged to continue separated. They could not bring the labourers to the resources. Was there ever a more absurd, was there ever a more cruel,

¹ A German Antarctic expedition is about to be despatched to do the work which Englishmen would have undertaken had their Government been alive to their opportunities.

position than that? Why was this? Because there was ¹ no intermediary whose business it was to bring the people where the resources were."

His Lordship suggested a remedy :—

"To have the two Governments agree upon a plan whereby the capital and the labour of the mother country could develop the natural resources of the colonies, to the mutual benefit of both."

It can be shown that such a scheme would well repay Britain, if that is all she would require to induce her to join therein.

The total number of paupers in the old country, in September 1885, was 68,000; in the corresponding period of the following year, 1886, they increased to 700,000, who cost the country at the rate of ten pounds per head, for we find that for one year £7,000,000 was paid for their support. It is appalling to find that in twelve months they increased by 12,000; in addition to these, the number of the poor who subsist on the barest necessities of life must be great indeed, nor must we forget how many are kept from starvation by private charity. It is true that the colonies would only receive youthful, healthy people, but the mother country could thin those nursery fields, from which her paupers are recruited, and thereby gradually lessen the heavy burden she is now groaning under. The space allotted will not permit me to deal further with this subject, but I think that, as we see around us so much squalid poverty and misery, ¹ it is the duty of those who have the knowledge, power, and influence to ameliorate the condition of these suffering people, whose destinies are in their hands. While it is wicked to neglect such a remedy as extensive emigration for the overcrowded population of Great Britain, it is wicked also to allow millions of square miles in the South Pacific to lie fallow for want of cultivators.

Consolidation of the Empire.—It is easy to condemn and find fault with men, their policies and measures. I have done so unsparingly, for I have given vent to my profoundest convictions, formulated after many years of experience and careful thought. I do not wish to leave this subject as I found it, but will offer a few suggestions, which, if acted upon, may help towards the consolidation of the British Empire.

I think that these grievances will always be liable to occur until a closer union is effected between Great Britain and a confederation of the several colonies in Australia. I shall not attempt to deal with any definite legislative measures upon the subject; they will follow in due time. My aim is rather to encourage good feeling, to maintain the loyalty, and to strengthen the bond of sympathy—more powerful than any constitutional acts. I think that the time for Imperial Federation has arrived, but its achievement depends very much upon what policy be now pursued by the people of Great Britain.

Australian Confederation.—Each of the Australian colonies, with the exception of West Australia, has a Government which is responsible for the internal administration. I think that a necessary preliminary to that Imperial unity at which we ultimately aim, is a confederation of these several colonies themselves. To such a confederation there are, under existing circumstances, great obstacles. I will shortly endeavour to point out how these obstacles may best be removed, but in the meantime I think that the Imperial Government could expedite matters by settling and defining in no ambiguous terms the action they intend to pursue in the future, when demands are made from those territories, which, unless divided, are too unwieldy for beneficial government. In granting letters patent for the division of any such territories, conditions should be included similar to those which the Duke of Newcastle thought necessary when separation was granted to Queensland. If such a line of policy were adopted, it would doubtless ensure a union of the colonies. For in the confederation which they were binding themselves to maintain, they would know what the exact limits of the respective colonies were to be, leaving no cause for dissension in our future General Federal Council, since the lines upon which further separation should be deemed advisable would have been laid down and thoroughly defined by the Colonial Office in England.

The area of Australasia, including New Zealand and Tasmania, is 3,075,030 square miles, being 680,972 square miles less than that of all Europe, but 47,439 square miles more than that of the United States. As I am treating of the continent of Australia only, by deducting the areas of New Zealand and Tasmania, we find that there remain 2,942,802 square miles. This immense area I propose to divide into manageable and suitable territories, to simplify the confederation of the whole, with the ultimate view of forming Imperial Federation. If my readers will glance at the map of Australia, they will follow the scheme without difficulty. The present colonies of New South Wales and Victoria may be left as they are; the remaining colonies in the continent require considerable readjustment to save complications in the future.

The colony of Queensland should be divided by a line from east to west, starting from Cape Palmerston, as was requested in the recent petition for separation.

Thus two colonies would be formed equal in importance to the first two in our group, the southern portion retaining the name of Queensland, while the northern new colony might well assume that of Kingsland.

Taking next the colony of South Australia and its northern territory, a very large area running through the continent from the south to the north coast; I would suggest that the northern boundary of South Australia should be defined along the 20th degree of

latitude; while it should be clearly understood that all the territory north of that line, known as the northern territory of South Australia, together with the portion of West Australia also lying to the north of the said 20th degree of latitude, be destined in the future for a separate colony, though at present remaining under the jurisdiction of South and West Australia respectively, until the number of its inhabitants and its increasing importance announce that the time for territorial separation has arrived.

This new colony will ultimately become one of the most important in the Australian group, through its proximity to India, Java, Singapore, and China. It is possible that in the future it will be advisable even to subdivide this territory; therefore the line, starting from a point on the 20th degree of latitude, running north to the sea between Queen's Channel and Cambridge Gulf, now the boundary line between the northern territory of South Australia and West Australia, should not be lost sight of, as it may serve us in the event of further separation. There still remains a very large area—namely, West Australia—whose coast-line will now extend from the 20th degree of latitude to where it touches the south-west boundary of South Australia, in the Great Australian Bight. This part of the continent being less fertile and having much unavailable country, I would propose dividing it in equal parts by a west and east line. I would, however, for the present, grant to West Australia a responsible Government over the whole territory, subject, however, to the condition that when circumstances arise demanding territorial separation, it should be granted.

Such is an outline of the plan I propose. Great deviations in detail may well be rendered desirable; I only wish to indicate the guiding principles of the policy which should, I think, be pursued. If the people of Britain desire Imperial Federation, the Colonial Office can do much in arranging with those colonies a well-defined policy of territorial adjustment.

Thus we create eight important colonies,¹ leaving to each a mean area of 347,850 square miles, none being without a seaboard of greater or less extent. Having due regard to the geographical positions and climatic influences of each, I think that, as individual colonies, their progress will be surer and more rapid, and that they will doubtless expand, and develop their resources to their own satisfaction, and to the general welfare of the whole. If some such course as I have suggested were followed, the difficulties of forming an Australian Confederation would disappear.

The Colonial Office in London must first leave no doubt in the minds of the colonists that in the future there will be no complications about territorial boundaries. There were great

¹ Tasmania would make the ninth, as she would doubtless join the Confederation.

issues at stake lately, when a petition was made for a division of Queensland; an important measure is now awaiting solution with regard to West Australia. If a satisfactory settlement herein be arrived at, the hands of the colonists are left more free for the development of their own confederation, now in embryo. The advantages of such a confederation in itself are obvious enough, for it would not only vastly facilitate the internal administration of Australia, but also simplify her dealings with the mother country; since the Colonial Office in Downing Street would then have to treat with the General Federal Council only, instead of with the Governments of separate colonies. An instance is before us: very serious complications may arise owing to the action of any one colony upon the Chinese question; but if this subject had to be treated by a General Federal Council, embodying the collective wisdom of the entire continent, the Imperial Government might rest assured that British treaties and international law would be fully considered.

Consolidation of the Empire.—I promised to point out the advantages which a consolidation of the scattered Empire would give. We find in Australia an immense territory, as large as Europe; yet the whole population at the present time is less than that of London. Statistics show that in 1886 there was not one individual to 600 acres. In that great land we have various climates; it will abundantly furnish all tropical products, from the most luscious fruits to the common necessities of life, such as rice, maize, sugar, coffee, tea, beef and mutton, cotton, wool and cereals; also gold, silver, copper, opal, tin, and other valuable ores; finally, it possesses inexhaustible fields of coal. Nature has been bountiful and prolific, for there abounds all that can make men happy—that can make a nation great—material to build up a mighty empire within the sea-girt shores. In this continent, which is about the three-eighth part of the whole British dominions, we can see a source of strength and of wealth of such vast importance, that it seems to be imperative to retain it as part of the Empire.

Supposing that a great European war broke out, there is no certainty that the Suez Canal would remain open, while complications might arise in India, China, or in South Africa. If occasion required, Australia could now send in a very short time men and horses, supplies and coal, and soon she hopes to be able to manufacture guns and ammunition.

With Albany, Thursday Island,¹ and Port Darwin fortified, Australia could help the mother country, and harass the common enemy by keeping our naval and mercantile marine well supplied with coal and stores, and keeping hostile Powers without them.

¹ Or rather Gooda Island, the sentinel which commands the gate to the South Pacific.

In this continent, surrounded by the sea, we have no rival Powers to share its advantages with us, as in America, Asia, Africa, and in New Guinea. If for no other feature but this, Australia is the most valuable of Britain's possessions.

The population is British. Australians are intensely English; we wish them to remain so, because it is thought that the British Isles will require in the future additional strength from without, props with sure foundations to lean upon. To ensure England's safety, and to make progress towards a higher development, the time has arrived when a consolidation of the Empire, already begun by a few, should receive the due consideration of the many—when endeavours should be made to find vent for surplus capital at home, by developing her resources abroad, "by sending labourers where they are crowded to where there are none," by relieving the distressed, hungry, and unclad, by some State colonization scheme.

This is England's duty, and this it should be her aim to achieve.

Concluding Remarks.—Before closing this paper, I wish to draw attention to a most important matter. We frequently hear from supporters of Imperial Federation that there is no need to push it on. But although it would be most injudicious to force it, every encouragement should be given, and for the following reason among others:—

I have said that patriotism and loyalty are the marked characteristics of the Australians, most of whom are either British or born of British parents, the pioneers and founders of Australia. It will be much easier for Great Britain to take steps now for the consolidation of her Empire with those who although Australians are intensely British, than when a new generation holds the reins of power, who having but few or no associations with Britain, will consider Australia as their mother country. They will doubtless endeavour to create Australia into a distinct nationality, and being of British descent they will be prepared to pass through any ordeal to attain their end.

I therefore consider that the basis upon which the constitution could rest should be framed now, and that the foundations should be laid, upon which to construct a United Empire.

Both in Britain and in her Colonial possessions, we have the material, we hold the power, we possess the machinery, and men who by united action are able to heat the iron, to weld the many slender parts into a strong, solid, compact, well-tempered whole. But Britain must be prepared to treat her offspring abroad as she does those at home. She must in some form grant to them representation in the Legislature, and not deal with them in the future as in the past, so graphically described by Mr. Froude in *Oceana*: "They were as birds hatched in a nest, whose parents would be charged with them only till they could provide for themselves, and the

sooner they were ready for complete independence the better the mother country would be pleased."

Truly the birds have been hatched under parental care; they now roost upon the topmost boughs, and are ready for flight, either farther from or closer to the maternal home.

I think the final direction may be indicated if we pursue a certain course which I have endeavoured to define.

Assuming that Imperial Federation is accomplished, further progress along the same path must follow. May we not even now aspire to nobler ends, when, as other nations of the earth follow our example, we may see arising the dawn of a great reformation, tending towards a Universal Unity—the Federation of Man?

ROBERT CHRISTISON.

THE FORSTER TRAGEDY IN IRELAND.¹

IF I were asked the readiest means of converting thoughtful Englishmen to Home Rule, I should be disposed to answer by placing Mr. Wemyss Reid's two volumes in every English home. So, I should advise Irishmen who are sore with experience of the follies of English misgovernment to study Mr. Forster's bruised life, as it is here revealed to us, and learn how much of pitiable misunderstanding there may be in the quarrels of nations. The acerbities of the story are gone. The infinite human pathos remains. However the physicians may describe his fatal illness, Mr. Forster died of the scars he received in Ireland in as real a sense as he would have died if he had not caught an early train the evening the Invincibles were searching the railway carriages at Westland Row for him. From Irish chapter to chapter of the second volume, we can almost see his hair whitening, and the stoop coming over his rugged shoulders, and the stout heart within him dying down as the omens of hopeless failure thickened around him. There are few things in the all too insincere records of statesmanship so touching as his daughter's description of his attempt to persuade himself that he felt happy the evening he lingered at the back of the Ladies' Gallery, to hear Mr. Gladstone's announcement of his resignation of the Irish Secretaryship. "Much cheerful talk at dinner," Mrs. Vere O'Brien's Diary notes, "but a curious feeling of excitement, and as though the tears were not very far off one's eyes. 'Well,' said father, 'I think you might all drink the health of the right honourable gentleman the member for Bradford, as Gladstone called me to-night.'" The tears would not have been far off most Irish eyes, if they could have rested on that melancholy festivity. One touch of human nature such as this would have had more influence in the Government of Ireland than all his police patrols and his nine hundred arrests. But Mr. Forster would have died rather than confess his softness. Herein you have the key to Mr. Forster's failure in Ireland, as well as to Mr. Balfour's failure on a totally opposite system. Mr. Forster was ashamed to show emotion as the ruler of an emotional race. Mr. Balfour would be ashamed to feel it.

¹ *Life of the Right Hon. W. E. Forster.* By T. Wemyss Reid. London: Chapman & Hall. 1888.

If Mr. Forster had gone to Ireland, as Mr. Balfour has gone, to "stand no nonsense"—that is to say, to trust to the policeman's Horn-book for information, and simply to knock on the head whatever he could not understand—there would have been nothing specially instructive in his fortunes. Some thirty generations of English governors went that road before him. They came back, each after his appointed time and according to his temperament, either heart-sick like Sir Ralph Abercrombie, or as gaily as Sir Walter Raleigh would have returned from a raid for Red Indian scalps. It used to be plain sailing enough for "silken aristocrats with hearts of steel." There were no questions asked. The poor Irish wood-kerne had no Mr. Parnell to move the adjournment of the House. The English common people had not the dimmest suspicion that their representatives were sending presents of poisoned wine to Shane O'Neil from Dublin Castle, and wiling the chiefs of the O'Moore country into the Rath of Mullaghmast to slay them after supper. The folk in the English shires knew no more of what was passing in Ireland than of what was passing in the country of the Anthropophagi and the men with two heads. Now it is wholly different. There would have been fifty Mitchelstown fusillades last winter, only that the one fusillade was heard the next morning in every home in Britain, and every ex-private of the Cape Mounted Rifles, who now gives orders to fire on an Irish crowd in the remotest mountain village, feels that millions of keen English eyes are fastened on his doings. That has a dampening effect upon Chief Secretaries as well as upon their subordinates. There are, of course, multitudes of hot-blooded Tory youths who will applaud a Chief Secretary all the more rapturously the freer he has been with his bullets and sarcasms. But a man of Mr. Balfour's keenness cannot help feeling that approval of this character is a mere *succès d'estime*, which can only be secured at all from a specially invited public, fenced around with lordly park-walls, and kept in a good-humour with slices of roasted ox and with merry-go-rounds. The average British father of a family, observing these things over the park-wall, does not think that that is the most judicious way of conquering ancient prejudices and appeasing a high-spirited race of many millions; and it is a mere question of time how soon and with how much brusqueness he will step in and astonish the merry-go-rounders by telling them so. It was just because Mr. Forster represented the seriousness, the sincerity, the deep determination to be just, of the average British citizen, that he was so much more formidable a governor of Ireland, from the Nationalist point of view, than Mr. Balfour is. That was also why his failure was a matter of such acute anguish to himself. It is easy to imagine Mr. Balfour intensely annoyed when, for example, Mr. Goschen confessed the collapse of his boast of six months ago that the National League in the "suppressed" districts was "a thing of the past;"

but who can conceive of Mr. Balfour bursting ~~into~~ that heart-cry of Mr. Forster's (heard only by his daughter): "I can never do now what I might have done for Ireland?" His disappointments would be of the order that one associates less with tears than with fretfulness. It is easy to imagine him frowning at Dr. Barr's *bêtises* at the Ridley inquest. It is impossible to imagine his appetite failing because his Bann Drainage Bill miscarried. When he quits Ireland it may be with regrets for Mr. James Arthur Balfour, but for Ireland—ridiculous. In his view, what Ireland requires is not so much governing as whipping. If he is not allowed to complete the job, it will be all the fault of the absurd squeamishness of the British workman in sparing the rod. Mr. Forster was made of more painstaking materials. "We can imagine," with Mr. Wemyss Reid, "the case of a Minister who could revel in the exercise of the vast powers with which Forster was entrusted, and who, inspired by a sense of the importance of the duty entrusted to him, could even feel a sense of exhilaration in wielding all the forces of the law in a contest with the chronic disorder and disaffection of the Irish people. . . . In fair fight he was prepared to strike hard. But he had looked to other means for pacifying Ireland than the rifles of the police or the bayonets of the soldiers, and he felt keenly the failure of the conciliatory policy which he had hoped to carry out." The moral, according to the best judgment I can form, of this most moving story of how a robust and honest spirit was beaten down is that, so long as there is any semblance of respect for representative institutions, England does but waste her best and most conscientious statesmanship in setting it to do Mr. Forster's impossible task, and that the only way of governing Ireland against her consent is by governing without ruth or scruple, and that not for a year or twenty years, but through unending ages.

The *sobriquet* of "Buckshot" by which Mr. Forster became known, and which seems to have wounded him as the nickname "Bloody" is said to tickle Mr. Balfour highly, is in itself pregnant with the secret of his failure. It was the irony of fate that the shy Quaker youth, whose first work in Ireland was as an angel of mercy in the cabins where the gaunt men ate Indian meal raw in their ravenous hunger, should have ended by being pictured with a cartouch-box slung round his shoulder, ready to deal death to this same people from under his broad-brimmed hat. It was an untrue picture, in the light of Mr. Wemyss Reid's book; for we are shown him anxiously speculating and devising how far crowds can be kept in check without firing. But that he felt keenly himself the incongruity which gave its sting to the nickname is plain enough from the words in which he introduced his Coercion Bill: "If I had thought that this duty would devolve upon the Irish Secretary, I would never have held the office. If I could have foreseen that this would be the result

of twenty years of Parliamentary life, I would have left Parliament rather than have undertaken it." That he was sincere in this, is now clear to those whom Mr. Wemyss Reid admits to his secret confidence; but what were the people to think who only knew that, when the Dublin Corporation waited upon him to complain of the ferocity with which the citizens were attacked, he replied gruffly that "clearing the streets was no milk-and-water matter;" and who only knew that the dead bodies of the girls and men slain at Belmullet, Tobercurry, Ballyragget, and Ballina, were the free translation given by an uncontrolled police to such encouragements? The fact is, that the honest sympathy and rectitude of intention which was in one respect Mr. Forster's strength was, in another respect, calculated only to develop that masterfulness—that unflinching conviction that he was right, and understood the whole problem through and through—which is destined to meet with more rebuffs even than crass inexperience or recklessness among a people so touchy, so subtly organized, so wholly incapable as the Irish of fitting into the rough mould which the grim woolstapler from Bradford had fashioned for them. His incapacity for understanding the Irish nature, no matter with what dogged determination he puzzled over it and persuaded himself he had mastered it, is revealed at a glimpse in his estimate of O'Connell. He found "the Liberator" among his mountains, with his pretty grandchildren and his dogs clustering around him; and the charmed guest does full justice to O'Connell's hospitality and courtesy as that of "a gentleman of the old school;" yet in the next breath honest Mr. Forster proceeds to remark, with a comic air of generosity: "I do not believe the man to be in the least conscious to himself of insincerity;" and again: "from several incidental expressions he made use of, I do believe he deeply feels the distress of the people!" I will be bound that Mr. Forster was "not in the least conscious to himself" of how deep an affront was implied in his dubious verdict, that the appalling famine scenes, which wrung the heart of a young stranger from Yorkshire, were not altogether matters of indifference to the tottering old chieftain whose life had been one long passionate struggle for his people, and whose heart-strings broke a few months later at their sufferings! Is it wonderful that he who with the best intentions in the world barely acquitted O'Connell of being the monster of callousness the *Times* charged him to be, should have lived to doubt whether the Irish leader of another generation is not the Master-Moonlighter the never-changing *Times* paints him! There is another curious exemplification in this book of that puzzle-headedness of sympathy with Ireland the very sincerity of which bewrayed his Irish administration. On May 8th, against a dark background of evictions, imprisonments, and assassination plots, appears this bright entry in Mrs. Vere O'Brien's diary: "Father read to us Mr. Robinson's report of the reception of the

seed-potatoes in County Mayo. This has been an altogether delightful incident, and it was a pleasure to hear the Chief Secretary reading anything so different from an outrage report; 'I wonder whether they would call me Buckshot Forster if I went down there?' pondered father." Here are to be noted two things: the wistful yearning for appreciation of his sympathy, and withal the strangely illogical expectation that a Government alms would be sufficient to purchase it for him. The Erris men *would* have called him Buckshot Forster, if they were not in dread of being sent to jail therefor. Why should they not? If the seed-potatoes were not necessary to save them from starvation, why should the British taxpayer be charged with the price of them? If the Government only performed the first function of government in saving them from death by hunger, why should these poor people be expected to acclaim the man who was imprisoning and persecuting the leaders whom they loved, and whose aim it was to place them for ever above the need of Government charity? Alas, for the sequel of this melting little incident! Mr. Forster did not go down among the poor Erris men; but a battalion of armed police did, to collect poor-rate off the unhappy wretches whom Mr. Forster had saved from starvation; and the result of their visit was that a poor young girl was transfixed through the bosom with a bayonet and brought home to her mother—dead!

These are elements of failure congenital, if I may so say, with every masterful Englishman—no matter how gracious his intentions—who, not content with pulling friendlily with Irishmen in common concerns, will insist upon dictating the Irishman's inmost household arrangements. But I do not think it is difficult to place one's hand upon the two special and (perhaps) avoidable errors which brought Mr. Forster's administration to ruin, though with these Mr. Wemyss Reid's book acquaints his readers but slightly. They are—first, the failure to estimate the reality of Mr. Parnell's power; and secondly, the failure to throw upon the House of Lords the responsibility of governing Ireland without the Compensation for Disturbance Bill which they rejected. Before the Bill was sent up to its doom in the House of Lords, Mr. Forster not obscurely intimated that he had nailed his colours to it as the very mainmast of his policy in Ireland. Had he either insisted upon his colleagues sending it up again with a peremptory message, or failing Mr. Gladstone's compliance, compelled him to seek another Irish Secretary, he would either have saved Ireland from the horrible aftermath of troubles that followed the famine of 1879–80, or he would have placed upon other shoulders the responsibility for the anarchy which he foresaw. The truth seems to be either that Mr. Forster and the Cabinet did not adequately estimate the gravity of the crisis which would arise when the 400,000 persons, at that very moment on the charitable relief lists, would be summoned to an account for their arrears of rent, or else the Liberal

majority, fresh from their great triumph over Lord Beaconsfield's foreign policy, did not care to imperil their laurels upon an Irish issue only half developed. There was a third course open to Mr. Forster on the rejection of the Bill. It was that which Sir M. Hicks-Beach had recourse to in the winter of 1886, when his own Cabinet had thrown out Mr. Parnell's Suspension of Evictions Bill. He might have snapped his fingers at the Lords by the extra legal methods first set in force by Sir Redvers Buller in Kerry, and by which to this hour Mr. Balfour keeps a clandestine check upon evictions—namely, by refusing police protection to carry out evictions which are deemed harsh ones. Mr. Forster did none of these three things. He did not resign as he had threatened to do; he did not take any other measure to restrain the harpy landlords who had stoutly denied the distress even after the Tory Lord Lieutenant's wife had appealed for subscriptions; and far from exercising the "dispensing power" by which Sir M. Hicks-Beach refused Lord Clanricarde the means of extermination, Mr. Forster seemed rather to reproach the landlords (vol. ii. p. 376) with their "remissness" in not carrying out their evictions "on a systematic plan." His illogicality in this respect had the further disastrous effect of estranging him hopelessly from Mr. Parnell because he was more logical. As the spring passed without any check upon evictions, or any prospect save a Land Bill in the late autumn which might follow the fate of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, and with a Coercion Bill in the meantime strenuously worked for the purpose of disarming the tenantry of their organization, Mr. Parnell and Mr. Dillon were driven into more and more bitter antagonism with the Government; and under the influence at one and the same time of the sinister counsels he received in Dublin Castle and of fierce and often cruel personal conflict with the Irish leaders in Parliament, it grew to be more and more Mr. Forster's *idée fixe* that Mr. Parnell's influence was not regarded by the people as their salvation, but was imposed upon them by terror, and that the statesman who should succeed in delivering them from their nightmare would acquire their secret, and eventually their open, gratitude. The root of all his errors was his misappreciation of the great man, who, for the first time in recorded history, was able to bind together all the wild and wayward forces of the Irish race indissolubly. For instance, Mr. Wemyss Reid, like the faithful biographer that he is, thinks it his duty to Mr. Forster to contrast the outburst of crime that arose contemporaneously with the Land League with the subsidence of agrarian crime during the preceding quarter of a century, omitting to note (1) that the Land League itself arose after and out of a period of distress, compared with which nothing so awful had been seen since the Great Famine; and (2) that if agrarian outrages had not flourished during the previous twenty years, it was

because the young men of the country in all those years were engrossed in a widespread conspiracy of at least two hundred thousand men to prepare for an armed insurrection in the first moment of England's difficulty. Mr. Forster did not see at all Mr. Parnell's wondrous achievement in weaning the whole youth of a hot-headed race to constitutional courses. He saw intensely that Mr. Parnell had not in addition performed the unperformable miracle of keeping the collision of half a million of starving people with their bankrupt landlords altogether free from bloodshed—the said collision being one in which Mr. Forster himself had proclaimed the tenantry entitled to a protection which the law did not empower him to give. It may be admitted that the Irish leaders misunderstood Mr. Forster with compound interest. It is too often forgotten that in these contests speech is the only Irish weapon left unproclaimed. Still more amazing, it is forgotten that the men whose rude language is rebuked, were themselves habitually reviled, as though they were scarcely human beings; and that the whole Tory party is at this moment chuckling with unconcealed delight, while the principal newspaper in England undertakes to prove the elected representatives of the Irish people to be venal assassins and fiends. The Irish members were not possessed of the Divine perfection which should have made them content to “answer not a word.” They struck back as they best could. The correct elocutionist is but a sorry match for forty thousand bayonets with jails and fortresses unnumbered. Nevertheless, it is one of the saddest reflections of our time to what an extent the judgment of one potent statesman on the Irish question was overthrown by a few whirling words from the Irish benches. Mr. Forster was not exempt from the infirmity. The assaults of Mr. Parnell's lieutenants became all the more galling for the attacks of Mr. Parnell's secret allies in the Cabinet. Angered by the baitings he underwent in Parliament, his “long and bitter struggles” in the Cabinet, and his disappointments upon disappointments in Ireland; dosed with daily letters from the landlords, a few samples of which Mr. Wemyss Reid enshrines, warning him that “the (death) warrants of several local Limerick gentlemen were signed,” that “unless the militia were removed before the 17th of March there would be a general rising,” and so on through every note of panic, absurdity and objurgation; his humane heart racked with every horrible detail of every outrage that could be laid to the charge of the people, while the hardships and brutalities they endured were sedulously concealed from him by the half a dozen Mr. Clifford Lloyds among whom he had partitioned Ireland; bewildered, mortified, horrified to find himself figuring as the tyrant of a country which it had been the dream of his youth to serve, and which in his heart he still honestly yearned to deserve well of: it is not difficult to understand his ever-deepening repugnance to the malign influence of that

pale, passionless young man, who for ever coldly thwarted him, and who kept so marvellously within the law that even so late as October 22 the law officers had to strain their consciences for a decent pretext to arrest him. That Mr. Parnell understood Ireland, and that Mr. Forster, with all his sturdy sense, did not, is the moral of every page of these sad Irish chapters; witness the letter to Mr. Gladstone of October 20, 1881: "What with the bishops deserting the League, our arrests and proclamations, and the Land Court opened to-day, I am now really sanguine of success" (not more "really sanguine" than is Mr. Balfour seven dreary years after, though the end is farther off than ever); his pathetic mistake in supposing that the people he addressed in Tullamore were secretly pining to throw off Mr. Parnell's yoke when they were all the time sullenly storming against the unfairness of Mr. Parnell's jailer in stealing this march on him under the guns of Mr. Clifford Lloyd's police; or that other exultant boast of his in the House of Commons that, once his Coercion Bill was law, "Mr. Parnell's police would be gone." Gone in awful earnest "Mr. Parnell's police" were; the priest, the sober town commissioner, the influential shopkeeper—it was the very men who "policed" and moderated the peasantry who were put into jail with Mr. Parnell; and it was when "Mr. Parnell's police were gone" that the Invincibles roamed the streets of Dublin unmolested, laying plot after plot against the unconscious Chief Secretary's life.

It would be, perhaps, a profitless inquiry at this time of day whether if Mr. Parnell had been suffered to test the Land Act in the winter of 1881, after the manner he had projected, instead of being cast into prison and his organization smashed into chaos, seven years of lawless chopping and changing in judicial rents might not have been averted. The "Kilmainham Treaty" is a more seductive theme of speculation. Was it wise to have formed it? or was it not rather thrice unwise not to have carried it out, even after all the merciless stabs that were inflicted upon it that mellow May evening on the sward of the Phoenix Park? Who can tell? Among us Nationalists there used to be many who winced under Mr. Parnell's letter to the full as keenly as many English Liberals winced the night when Mr. Forster, with an excusable touch of the old Adam, reminded his ex-colleagues of the missing passage. I don't think there is wincing any longer on the subject. I have myself always believed it to have been one of the boldest strokes of statesmanship of the century. At the very moment when the passions of the two nations seemed to have brought them to an irreconcilable *impasse*, Mr. Parnell's clear vision suddenly showed them a straight and simple road to an understanding which has since, under the warmer rays of Mr. Gladstone's genius, ripened into a sincere and lasting friendship between the British and Irish masses. The buoyant Liberal majority of 1880 was still in the flush of its

strength, and there can be little doubt that, but for the staggering blow dealt at Mr. Parnell in the Phoenix Park, the Irish Parliament would have been long ago in harness, and careworn years of sleepless struggle, pain, and risk might never have made their furrows in the cheeks of many of us, great and small. Whether the evening Lord Spencer saw that awful scuffle opposite his windows, it might not have been even still possible to withstand the hoarse roar of anger that swelled through England; whether the moment when the universal Irish heart was quivering with horror at Lord Frederick Cavendish's fate, was not the ideal moment for unflinchingly adhering to the Kilmainham Treaty, rather than for despairfully falling back into the shadows, is one of those riddles on which the Sphinx will never relax her lips. Enough that the despair is over, and in a great degree the shadows.

When all is said, it is the human side of Mr. Forster's story that will have the most abiding interest. It is the pity of it! For Englishmen, that of this great Englishman, as perpetually of this great Empire, Ireland should be the thorn and the undoing. For Irishmen, that the shaggy, kindly, rough-hewn Saxon man might so easily have been a friend, if he had not been doomed to be a ruler. His life would be an argument for using none but bad and heartless men in governing Ireland, if it were not an immeasurably stronger argument for letting her govern herself according to her own genius, or, if you prefer the phrase, according to her own humour. Perhaps Mr. Forster's very greatest shortcoming as a ruler of the Irish people was his almost aggressiveness in concealing the infinite deal of human nature which Mr. Wemyss Reid discloses in him. He had equipments even more essential than intellect to the happy governing of men—a conscience and a heart. His comparatively mild Coercion Act is prefaced, not with the jaunty thesis that it creates no new crime, but with the sorrowful admission that "this suspension of Habeas Corpus is a most violent, and I may almost say brutal, remedy." If he watches his political prisoners (as he does keenly) it is to see whether a dying mother misses them from her bedside, not to find material for amusing the young Tory gentlemen of England with their sufferings. In the dark tale of his heart-burnings in Ireland, and the plottings of his minor colleagues in the Cabinet, the loyal relationship between Mr. Gladstone and himself shines with something of the tenderness of an antique idyll—the poor broken Minister with his pathetic, "I feel it is my hard lot to bring you nothing but anxieties;" his heroic old master answering ever blithely: "The highest courage is to meet difficulty with a cool head and a warm heart, and that is what you are doing." For Mr. Forster, night has closed over the battlefield where he stoutly fought and fell. Those who might so much more easily than he have gone down against the tremendous forces he wielded will be the last to disturb his sleep with a churlish word.

MARRIAGE REJECTION AND MARRIAGE REFORM.¹

AMONG the many complicated social problems at present engaging the attention of thoughtful minds, there is none which has greater and graver claims upon it than the question, What is to be the future of marriage? It is a question which touches at so many different points upon so many sensitive places of our human nature—so many sanctities, beliefs, convictions, interests, prejudices—that there has been, hitherto, a certain hesitation in approaching it. It has been pondered in private and discussed *en petit comité* rather than publicly canvassed, such references as are made to it in the press and elsewhere being chiefly of a veiled and oblique character—not of the sort which he who runs may read. And yet a very real and even painful interest in it is spreading day by day, and day by day it is assuming proportions which seem to demand that it should be lifted out of the esoteric stage and take its place among those questions which, in the full light of day, are patiently, candidly, and courageously threshed out. To the present writer it appears that no apology is required for an attempt in the direction of publicly ventilating a subject of supreme importance to society which has latterly engrossed individual thought to a far greater extent than is commonly supposed. Timid persons always wince at the free handling of questions which they find it more convenient not to regard as questions at all; bigoted ones always frown upon what they consider disrespect to institutions which are, for them, indissolubly bound up with ceremonial observances and supernatural sanctions; but to the honest thinker there is no sin like the cowardice which shirks even an unpopular investigation of unpalatable facts, and no blasphemy like the assumption that the universe contains anything more worthy of wonder and worship than truth. Again, there is a large class of minds, of whom it cannot fairly be said that they are either pusillanimous or fanatical, to whom the idea of any change—any development—in connection with marriage, is somewhat bewildering. The mere suggestion implied in the heading of this article that there is, or that there may be, in store for marriage a future other than its

¹ This paper is not intentionally a reply to Mrs. Caird's article on "Marriage" in the August number of this REVIEW: it was written some time before that article was published.

present, falls with a certain repellent strangeness on their ear. Without any wilful hostility to new ideas, they share the natural human distaste for foreignness, the ingrained human suspicion of the untried and unaccustomed; they are puzzled by the interest the topic excites; they fail to grasp the necessity for any commotion about it, for any re-judgment of a social institution having the permanence and stability which, in their thought, attach to the institution of marriage. The truth is that the sociological, as distinguished from the biological aspects of the great modern conception of evolution, of progressive development, have been, as yet, but imperfectly apprehended. The average mind does not, as yet, at all adequately realize the applicability of the evolution theory to the whole of existence, nor perceive that if it explains the building up of our bodily frame, it also furnishes the key to our condition as moral, intellectual, and social beings. For the immenso majority—even in these days of the popularizing of science and the rapid dissemination of all kinds of information—the notion of development, of secular growth and change, is confined to the organic world. The Darwinian theory of human evolution is tacitly or explicitly admitted on all hands, and we have now no more objection to acknowledging the influence of natural selection upon our own physical characteristics than upon those of our horses or our pigeons. But the new teaching has scarcely spread to the realm of social institutions, nor penetrated the domain of our every-day life. Sociologically speaking, we remain pre-Darwinian—pre-Spencerian. We are as persistently hostile to the relative as very children. We regard all our institutions, customs, conventions, as part of a fixed order of things. We embrace the halting compromises, the makeshifts, the blindfold, tentative—so to speak, provisional arrangements of our predecessors as final, just as they themselves, with more excuse, accepted them as final. We do not see that none of these things are absolute; that they are forward steps, not resting-places; stages of human progress; rounds of the ascending spiral which leads from mere animalism up to the human ideal. But whatever may be the case with the mass—and some such hypothesis as the foregoing seems needed to account for the slowness of the majority to face difficult social problems, or to perceive approaching social change—there is, as has been pointed out, an increasing minority who occupy themselves increasingly with this particular problem of the evolution of marriage. It is time that voice should be given to their thought; that latent speculation should be replaced by open discussion, and that a full, free, and fearless handling of the subject should, as it alone can, bring matters to something like an issue.

These independent thinkers, then, may be divided into two classes: first, those who have abandoned all respect for marriage, even when

outwardly conforming to it, and who, for the most part esoterically, promulgate their creed—sometimes, with the courage of their convictions, acting on their theories themselves : secondly, those who are profoundly dissatisfied with the institution as it exists at present, but who desire to purify and to reform—not to abolish it. Let us, before considering the attitude of these two sections more in detail, try to discover what it is that has led to their disaffection ; what it is that has produced this phenomenon of a number of intelligent people, who, agreeing perhaps in little besides, agree in their disloyalty to what they term “ conventional ” marriage.

The cheap explanation will, of course, be at once forthcoming that these objectors are merely the children of their time ; that they do but share in that general revolt against authority in all departments of life which is the note of an unsettled, transitional, above all, democratic age. There are no restraints, it will be urged, so galling to people bent on getting rid of all forms of coercion as ecclesiastical or theological restraints. Free-thought has made havoc of the ceremony of marriage, just as, in the past, Protestantism abolished the sacrament of marriage. Nothing savouring of sacerdotalism, nothing smacking of superstition, nothing attaching in any manner to discarded sanctions or exploded dogmas can weigh seriously with the enlightened thinker of the nineteenth century, who is essentially a law unto himself, and recognizes no superior, human or divine. Take that conspicuous instance (it will be said) of the disintegration of thought upon this subject afforded by the private life of one of the greatest writers—ay, and greatest moralists—of the century. How can we explain the behaviour of George Eliot with regard to the marriage-rite, except as an act of revolt against an institution associated for centuries with the rule of a languishing church, with the domination of an unmasked priestly caste, with the despotism of an outworn creed ?

Now, although there may be some truth in all this, reasoning of this kind is surely, on the whole, superficial, and quite inadequate to explain all the facts. Surely the true explanation lies deeper. Startling though it may sound to many, would it not be nearer the truth to say that the modern revolt against the marriage-bond springs—not from any such shallow, headstrong self-assertion—but from what is deepest, most permanent, and most distinctively human in us ? It seems to the present writer, at any rate, that, in spite of all deductions, it is not to the negative and destructive, but to the higher constructive and progressive faculties of our nature that we must look for the root of the prevailing discontent with arrangements that were good enough for our forefathers. And it is very certain that whoever would interpret the movement aright, whoever aspires in any degree to guide it, must begin by placing himself in sympathy with its essence—however dubious may be some of its

concomitants—and by recognizing, at the outset, ~~that~~ this, at least, is natural and noble. For what is the essence, the secret and kernel of this discontent? It is neither more nor less than a quickened allegiance to the only true sanctifier of the supreme human union—Love; it is a ripening reverence for the vivifying and ennobling spirit of the life-tie between man and woman, as distinguished from the debasing and paralysing letter; it is a fresh effort of travelling humanity away from lower forms and towards that purified monogamy which is the ultimate human relation; it is, in a word, the growing tendency to substitute for a conventional legal contract true marriage. Mr. Herbert Spencer says of monogamy, that “any changes to be anticipated” (in the connubial relation) “must be in the direction of completion and extension of it.” Have we not here the dawning of some such change? And is not the feeling now setting in so strongly against the conventional bond merely a sign that such “completion and extension” of monogamy—that is, of his “primitive tendency”—has become more and more indispensable to civilized man? It is impossible to read that section of Mr. Herbert Spencer’s *Principles of Sociology* which sums up the results of modern research in this field—the section on Domestic Institutions—without being convinced that it is a primitive tendency, a tendency which has “long been growing innate,” and from which such infra-human forms as promiscuity, polyandry, polygyny, have been indeed “temporary deviations,” induced by the stress of circumstance. Even among primates inferior to man, we are told, something like monogamy exists; and throughout human history there has been, as it were, a leaning towards and a longing for monogamy, every lower kind of union producing its brood of retributive evils, notably degradation of women and injury to children. Monogamy itself, however, is plainly susceptible of development, and if, in its earlier stages, it implies merely the legal possession of one woman by one man, in its later purified forms it signifies a great deal more—even a noble and equal fellowship of hearts; a life-union based upon love, not law; too sensitively proud in its depth of devotion, too stable and splendid in its religious fealty, to concern itself greatly with outward ceremonies and legal forms and prescribed protestations of faith. And if, as yet, it is only the few who have risen to such a conception of the monogamic union, if the majority of civilized men and women are still in an earlier stage of monogamic development, is this a reason why imagination and speculation should be wholly restricted to the less perfect form—why we should not give glad hospitality to any tokens of a latent thirst for something higher and better? Were it not better to acknowledge the dignity of this thirst, and, in general, to learn more reverence for the mighty principle of progressive development as we behold it at work in the

moral world? Why can we not be prevailed upon to admire in it a law of nature as imposing and sublime as the laws which govern the stars in their courses and order the seed-time and harvest? Why, to clothe the question in other words, do we not trace the "*finger of God*" in this slow, secular feeling of man after his highest good, and worship it, as Moses worshipped it in the new leap towards justice and righteousness which his code embodied, or a greater than Moses, when the time came to substitute enthusiasm for obedience and blessings for commands, and he, "by the finger of God," cast out the "devils" of legality, of hypocrisy, of pharisaism, of formalism? It is, then, submitted that the result of a careful and unprejudiced survey of the facts will be that the ferment of opinion in the present day on the subject of marriage is, upon the whole, and in its essence, a good thing. It is further submitted that the movement in favour of, at least, some important modifications in the institution, is neither to be despised, nor to be dreaded, nor to be condemned; but is to be, by all lovers of righteousness and of progress, studied, respected, guarded from aberration, and guided in the paths of wisdom.

Let us now return to examine the respective positions of the two classes into which it was suggested that the malcontents might be divided, considering, first, those who wish to do away with the institution of marriage, and who are working openly or secretly, directly or indirectly, towards that end; secondly, those who desire—not to abolish—but to modify and to reform it. It will subsequently be our task to try to discover on which side the larger share of truth is to be found, and which party is more likely to determine, or aid in determining, the future of marriage.

No student of recent literature—certainly no student who takes count of ethical as well as of purely literary or æsthetic tendencies—can have failed to observe tokens of the kind of veiled propaganda now being carried on by the former class of theorists. When doctrines of the sort make themselves felt, as these undoubtedly do, in general literature; when writings of the popular class, which register, as it were, the extent to which new ideas and new ideals have taken hold of the public mind, give frequent hints of them, then we are surely justified in asserting, with some confidence, that the time is not far distant when they will be promulgated in less guarded ways.¹ Many recent novels, poems, and newspaper articles, constituting a considerable section of the lighter literature of the last few years, afford abundant evidence that the question is not only in the air, but fast ripening for solution. One example, taken almost at random from modern fiction, and another, also selected at hap-

¹ In the sociological section of Mr. Karl Pearson's *Ethic of Free Thought*, published since this passage was written, we have an example of what may be expected in the near future in the way of open inculcation of anti-marriage doctrines by serious thinkers.

hazard from modern poetry, may serve to illustrate the tendency referred to.

Considerable difference of opinion has been observable among reviewers and others as to the morality, or the reverse, of that powerful first production of a fresh and vigorous young writer, the *Story of an African Farm*. Some critics have opined that, since the heroine, who spurns the shackles of conventionality in marriage, as in everything else, loses her child, and dies in a horrible anguish of solitude, the moral aim of her creator cannot fairly be called in question. Others, on the contrary, have maintained that the fate of Lyndall does not necessarily imply the ideas of retribution or expiation, but is merely painted in accordance with the author's sombre views of life, views which are, in turn, inspired by her complete repudiation of orthodox beliefs and of the ordinary codes of morality. They deem that such a history of rebellious lawlessness, as it appears to them, can only influence young minds for evil, and they deplore the publication of such a work, as one more indication of the anarchic tendencies of the day in religion and morals, as well as in politics. The truth, probably, lies somewhere between these two opposite impressions. Lyndall's sufferings and tragic end may not have been intended to be in any sense expiatory, and yet it may be harsh and unjust to say that her history is one which must necessarily have a deleterious effect upon the reader's mind. For some of us, Lyndall stands out, a living palpitating figure, among the crowd of novel-nonentities; sharply outlined against the confused shadows of half-real people and things; vivid, impressive—not because hers is a very unique or even exceptional character—in *the germ* it is certainly not so—but because she is the embodiment, powerfully and sincerely drawn, of ideas and opinions daily growing more frequent amongst us, and with which, so to speak, we have got to reckon. This child of nature, nursed in nature's lap, strong of head, strong of nerves, deep-hearted, compact of passion, is really no anarchist, no advocate of lawlessness and libertinage; she is just—*alone, désorientée*, in the dark, greedy for truth, greedy for happiness, and entirely resolved not to make believe that she possesses these things, when, in fact, she has known nothing of them. Such early training and such social surroundings as she has had have landed her in chaos; she was nourished and brought up on lies; lies for lullabies in all her slumbers; lies to quench all the ardent questionings of her imperious intellect. It is matter of course, proud, passionate, and true as she is, that she should revolt, and be driven, like most truth-seekers and love-seekers, into the wilderness, there to painfully beat out her own path, unguided and unaided, and, less fortunate than some, to perish among the rocks and briars of the way. Her creator does not, perhaps, unreservedly approve her; but neither does she consciously punish her. With vital sympathy, with an emotion

so profound that you hear, as it were, a heart-beat in every word, she delineates the "little human woman" who, in her hatred of falsehood, of injustice, of cruelty, of tyranny, is thrown back upon her own untutored instincts, and lives and dies in fierce defiance of a world which, as she knows it, is almost wholly false, unjust, cruel and tyrannous. What Miss Schreiner does consciously or unconsciously endorse—and this is the point which immediately concerns us—is Lyndall's classing of marriage among the things which have become open questions for her. She is clearly in sympathy with those friends and lovers of Lyndall who see nothing in her *liaison* that need impair their worship of her. Gregory Rose, covering her feet with kisses as she lay upon her death-bed; Waldo, crying for her to the stars in the deadly anguish of bereaved souls without hope—these people are but the mouthpieces of the author's tenderness for a woman who has deliberately, and of her own freewill, preferred concubinage to marriage. There is nothing in the minds of these men—there is nothing in their creator's mind—either of the old-world contempt for the "fallen" woman, at best sentimental toleration of her, or of the regretful and restorative pity which the new world is beginning to extend to fallen men and fallen women alike. Lyndall is still, with them all, the same supremely gifted, supremely sweet, beautiful and captivating child-woman that she was when her revolt was against false theology merely, or against the foul and bestial deeds of men and women who tortured Kaffirs and dumb animals and little children, while the names of God and Christ were for ever on their lips. There is no indication in the book that the revolt against marriage comes under a different category; no indication of a distinct boundary line between theological controversies and moral obligations; no hint that, apart from all the creeds, a human being is at all less noble, less praiseworthy, less lovable, for surrendering advisedly the white flower of a blameless life. Rather, the suggestion is that it is commendable to repudiate a life-tie which is very likely to outlast love, and that "frail," "mortal," "erring," as Lyndall might be, yet she was so only in that general sense in which the whole human family are so, and not at all in the sense in which we use the words when speaking of an Effie Deans or a Hetty Sorrel. There is here no sense of something sacred violated, something white sullied, something whole fractured; there is an entirely new way of looking at the sexual relation—a view of sexual morality to which the better class of Victorian imaginative literature, at any rate, affords no parallel. How are we to account for a writer of the moral calibre of the author of the *South African Farm*—a writer whose moral intuitions are literally poignant in their reality and intensity, with whom justice is a passion, and pity a kind of possession, and truth as the breath of life—how are we to account for such a writer being (it would seem) insensible to the duty and beauty of the culminating

human grace of chastity—that is, of wedded and unwedded spotlessness? “I like to experience, I like to try,” says Lyndall to the father of her child. “I cannot marry you because I cannot be tied; but, if you wish, you may take me away with you, and take care of me; then when we do not love any more we can say good-by.” Surely there is but one explanation of these nihilistic doctrines being found upon such lips, of the gospel of destruction and disorder being, as it were, acquiesced in by a pure-hearted man like Waldo, of experiments like Lyndall’s being condoned practically, by a high-minded writer, like the author of this vivid, earnest, original book. Surely the explanation is that she has herself ceased to regard legal marriage with respect, that she believes, and is endeavouring covertly to make us believe in a union which shall be something higher, truer, and better than legal marriage.¹

The poem to which reference was made as illustrating the modern tendency to insinuate a disparaging view of marriage, and to hint at some higher ideal, is a new variation on the theme of the first part of *Faust—Prince Lucifer*, by Mr. Alfred Austin. It is true that Lucifer-Faust ends by marrying the peasant girl, whom he has—well, the old harsh word is perhaps hardly in place here—whose utter trust he has won, as soon as he discovers that her Catholic bias is even stronger than her faith in him. It is also true that, in a significant scene at the close of the drama, he partially admits that her unsophisticated moral and religious creed may, after all, be truer or, at least, as true as his own philosophy. Still the general impression left by a perusal of Mr. Austin’s poem is that the author intends us to reconsider our, presumably, stereotyped views on the subject of marriage, and to be compelled to the admission that there is a good deal to be said on both sides. Prince Lucifer is, like Lyndall in the *African Farm*, no anarchical destroyer of institutions for mere destruction’s sake; no nihilistic hater of the moral law, on the general ground that law, of whatever kind, is opposed to license. He is meant to be a high-principled man, a “soaring mind;” an idealist; and, although his conception of love—the educating of a docile village Gretchen to become his echo—falls, perhaps, a little short of the ideal of most persons of culture nowadays, still it is a real and lasting love that binds him to Eve, and not one of the “many counterfeits of love,” which he pleads guilty to having previously “assayed.” He abstains from marriage on principle—not from lack of principle—desiring indeed

“That Love shall have the birthright of his wings,
No longer like a captive eagle, blink
Chained to a nuptial perch;”

but not desiring that Love should abuse his freedom; believing in a

¹ Another recent novel, *The New Antigone*, deals largely with the doctrine of “Free Love,” not, however, as evolved by a solitary young girl out of her inner conscious-

supreme life-tie which shall transcend all lower, transient ones ; and intending Eve to be

“ All unto me as I all unto her
By lasting choice of unlocked liberty.”

It is something higher, not something lower, than marriage of which he dreams. In his proud retort to the village priest who comes to his castle to expostulate with him for abducting one of his flock, there is no hint of the sullen defiance of conscious ill-doing. The tone is rather that of conscious superiority, of one who has reached a pinnacle of enlightenment and even of virtue as yet inaccessible to the crowd. “ You cannot marry her,” says Father Gabriel, reminding the exiled prince of the disparity between his own station and that of his “ uncontracted and precarious toy.” “ How know you that ? ” Lucifer sharply rejoins.

“ I cannot marry her ? Say, would not, rather.
’Tis not her birth nor simpleness that bans
The rites you guard ; heraldic blazonries
Are fireworks for the foolish. It is love
Enjoins we still leave Nature to complete
The piece she hath begun. Why interrupt
The slow, sure weaving of love’s natural bond
With marriage contract, sudden, forcible,
Strong till ’tis strained and snaps ? That will I never.
For marriage is the winding-sheet of love ;
And, after it, most mortals in their hearts
Carry a coffin uninterred. Could I
On to the unwritten covenant of love
Append that clogging and unneeded seal,
This simple shepherdless. . . .
Should buy your sanction.”

One of Mr. Austin’s critics contrasts the behaviour of Prince Lucifer with that of Shelley. Shelley, he points out, placidly acquiesced in the marriage-rite, although he did not believe in it, for his wife’s “ comfort as a social creature.” Prince Lucifer, on the other hand, while bowing to convention for his wife’s comfort as a religious creature, does so with the mental conflict and distress of a man who is compelled to surrender an exalted and long-cherished ideal. The reviewer holds that Shelley’s attitude was the more comprehensible of the two, and doubts “ if many men have been influenced by Lucifer’s feeling, or if any man whatever since the world began, or since the marriage-rite was celebrated, whether by the Church or a more secular power, has been deterred from marrying any woman by the idea that marriage involved a loss of spiritual

ness, but as imbibed with her mother’s milk by the nursling of an “ advanced ” form of Socialism. But in this case it seems clear that the author’s own sympathies are not on the side of the revolutionary views whose true tendency he exposes by an ingenious *reductio ad absurdum*.

union." But surely, at the present time, it is precisely Lucifer's feeling and not Shelley's that is confronting us at every turn. Shelley was "conscious of no serious mischief done," when he consented to be married, presumably because he never had any notion of being permanently bound either by a ceremony or by the "lasting choice of unlocked liberty." Whereas the Lucifers of to-day are conscious of mischief done when they submit to marriage, because they do believe in a higher bond, and regard the outward ceremony not merely as an empty form, but as a positive slur on the inward and spiritual tie. The nineteenth-century revolt against marriage of which this light-bearer, this Lucifer, is a fair type, has some of the elements of a religious crusade. The eighteenth-century revolt which Shelley embodies, was, in comparison, mere sedition. It was bent, like the Revolution in general, upon upsetting, pulling down; and by its fruits it was speedily known. The private life of Rousseau, its first prophet, with his coarse, ignorant Thérèse, and his repudiation of the elementary duties of parenthood; the private life of Shelley, its laureate, with its abject desertion—not only of children, but of a wife who was herself little more than a child—for a child-mistress—and its hideous environment of sycophancy, profligacy, and suicide; the domestic history of not a few modern Socialist and Nihilist representatives of the creed of Rousseau and Godwin and Shelley—these were and are some of the fruits of a reaction which was mainly *frondeur*, mainly destructive and negative. With the school of Shelley and the Revolutionists we are not at present concerned, nor do doctrines which imply a speedy reversion to promiscuity require other refutation than that which all such errors in chronology receive sooner or later at the hands of experience. That it has not been without influence upon the movement of to-day—nay, that it in some sense sowed the seeds of it—is a matter of course. But the child does not in the least resemble the parent. The old movement was destructive. The new movement is constructive. The old movement was all for liberty. The new movement is for liberty too, but for liberty as the essential element and primary condition of a lasting and a loving union.

But, it will here be objected, how is this assumed desire for a permanent, if voluntary, tie to be reconciled with Lucifer's aspiration that "Love should have the birthright of his wings," with Lyndall's "I cannot be tied. When we do not love any more we can say good-bye?" How is it to be reconciled with such a confession of faith as that of one of the latest exponents of the new teaching:—"Personally, I see no reason why two persons, who may be in no way responsible to a third, should be bound together for life, whether they will or no."¹ Does not, it will be asked, the new school like

¹ *Ethic of Free Thought*, p. 384.

the old practically inculcate a kind of promiscuity? Is the late nineteenth century really nobler, or only a little less sincere, than the late eighteenth century? Is it genuine in its protestations of belief in monogamy—a monogamy all the more real for being un-legalized? Are all its fine phrases about a loftier spiritual tie, about “a perfectly free yet generally lifelong union,” any real guarantee that it will not terminate in license—nay, does not secretly believe in license? The answer will be best given later, when having turned to the marriage-reformers, as distinct from the marriage-rejectors, and considered their position for a moment, we proceed to compare the relative claims of the two sections to gain the ear of the world at large, and to seriously influence the future evolution of marriage.

Were we to search recent literature for examples of this less “advanced” but not less noteworthy form of the modern dissatisfaction with conventional marriage, the WESTMINSTER REVIEW itself would not contain the illustrations that might be given. And it would be superfluous to adduce evidence of the patent fact that there exists a very large number of people, who, while they are bent upon preserving the institution of marriage intact, are, if possible, still more bent upon modifying, beautifying, and elevating it. A very brief account of their quarrel with marriage in its threefold aspect, as a legal contract, a social institution, and a religious ordinance, will make it clear that we have not here to do with a small body of theorists or fanatics, but with a considerable section of the community—a section probably embracing most thoughtful persons who concern themselves about the matter at all.

Viewed as a legal contract, then, the marriage-reformers take grave exception to the institution as now existing, on the ground of its inequality—that is, of the preference shown for the interests of one contracting party over those of the other. The spirit of the laws affecting marriage, as well as the interpretation and administration of those laws, have been, and in many respects still are, notoriously hostile to the wife. In the matter of property, a married woman had, speaking generally, no control whatever over her own earnings or her own fortune, which were entirely at the mercy of an unscrupulous husband, until, within the last decade, the Married Women’s Property Act, extorted with difficulty from a reluctant Legislature, partially remedied a clamant injustice. In the matter of the Guardianship of Infants, legislation has still more lamely redressed a grievance which presses more hardly upon wives and mothers in proportion as their flesh and blood are dearer to them than their balance at the banker’s. Here the shadow of the *patria potestas* still lingers with such malignant effect amongst us, that even when the national conscience awoke to the iniquity of ignoring the inalienable natural right of the mother to the guardianship of her own

offspring (unless disqualified by insanity or crime), our lawmakers could not be prevailed on so to violate the tradition of centuries as to place her once and for all on a level with the father, and to proclaim her rights absolutely equal with his. The utmost they could be persuaded to concede to the mother was the power to act jointly with any guardian appointed by the father, thus removing what has been justly called "the monstrous right which a father possessed of leaving by will a guardian who could take the child away from the custody of its mother for no other reason than his own will." In cases of separation and divorce, the consequences of the "legal theory of marriage, that the wife is 'under cover,' completely absorbed in the personality of her lord and master," are frequently as cruelly oppressive to her as in the case of the ugly tyranny of the dead hand. The custody of children being in these cases a matter within the discretion of the Court, it is singular how often that "discretion" issues in the resolve that an innocent wife shall suffer—through her children—rather than a guilty husband. And yet when even a writer of Mr. Spencer's impartiality and breadth of view can, forecasting the future status of woman, complacently predict that "legal decisions from time to time demanded by marital differences, involving the question which shall yield, are not likely to reverse all past decisions;" and that "evenly though the law may balance claims, it will, as the least evil, continue to give, in case of need, supremacy to the husband, as being the more judicially minded" (!)—what can we expect from the average administrator of the law? Obviously that the rights of even a bad father will be tenderly respected, while she to whom the labour and sorrow of bearing and rearing them is allotted, will be bereft of her children. With such a state of things, however, it does not appear to the reformers at all "likely" that the future will rest content, and it is safe to predict that a condition of the law which by its inequality helps to make true marriage impossible will have to be gradually amended, and that "legal decisions" which are notoriously one-sided and oppressive will have to be adjusted to the requirements of the public conscience. But it is the law of divorce itself which presents the most flagrant instance of the hardships to which the legal contract, as now existing, may subject the married woman. Leaving on one side for the moment the general question—by no means a foregone conclusion, as the majority of the modern world would seem to have decided—of the justifiability of divorce, it must be admitted by all candid minds that the actual law of divorce in this country is shamefully unjust to the wife. The evil is so notorious; the premium put upon male infidelity and upon the more exquisite forms of educated cruelty is so patent; the unfairness of making the contract terminable by the husband, but not by the wife, under precisely similar circumstances, is so egregious, that to dilate upon the subject is

needless. Suffice it that this particular legal anomaly—whatever may befall the others—can hardly survive the admission of women to the franchise. Sooner or later it must succumb to the attacks of those who already see clearly that if the marriage-contract is to be preserved it must be in many respects remodelled, cleansed of the remnants of barbarism, and purged of the old bad leaven of injustice to women.

Regarded in the light of a social institution, marriage, according to the idealists with whom we are now concerned, calls for reform more loudly than even when legally considered. The chief count in their indictment against it from the social point of view is, of course, the prevalence of those semi-civilized usages which, in Mr. Spencer's words, "*made, and continue to make*, considerations of property predominate over considerations of personal preference." They note, with him, that the primitive practices of wife-purchase and husband-purchase, "*though they have lost their original gross forms, persist in disguised forms*" in our midst, and they are keenly alive to the necessity of reinforcing that growing disapproval which, he tells us, is already beginning to be expressed "*of those who marry for money or position.*" This disapproval, it may be observed in passing, is expressed not merely by students of the past evolution of marriage, who have the quickened sense that is born of knowledge, of the barbaric character of such alliances, and can appreciate the humiliation of preferring a lower stage of culture after a higher one has been reached; but by thousands of men and women to whom the word evolution is meaningless or terrifying, who are not aware that marriage has had a history, and who rely solely upon their own instinctive consciousness of "*duty*" or personal responsibility to society in the matter. The spectacle of a poor noble presenting himself to a wealthy coal-owner or brewer, and saying to him, in fact, though of course not without suitable "*disguise*," "*Sell me your daughter or your ward, and I will sell you my title and position;*" the spectacle of beautiful girls, whether home-bred, American, or colonial, crying in our market-places, "*My beauty in exchange for a name or a fortune;*" the spectacle of the mothers of marriageable daughters toiling and moiling, contriving and intriguing, to barter their youth, and often their innocence, for material advantages to which the husband, often mature in years and hoary in sin, is regarded as a merely unpalatable or unimportant appendage—these melancholy spectacles, and others like them, are beginning to inspire a degree of abhorrence hitherto unknown. They are beginning to be viewed—consciously or unconsciously, by evolutionists and orthodox alike—not as inevitable concomitants of civilization, but as relics of savagery which every civilization worthy of the name must sooner or later repudiate. Another social abuse in connection with marriage, which, in the opinion of many, cries to Heaven for redress,

is the difficulty—almost the impossibility—of becoming really acquainted before betrothal. The source of this evil is probably to be found in our wilful violation of Nature by separating those whom she set in families, almost from the cradle to the grave, enforcing artificial distinctions in the nursery, emphasizing them in the schoolroom, carrying on education, recreation, occupation apart, until girl and boy, with the best will in the world to be comrades and helpmeets all through life—not in married life only—end by looking each on the other not merely as a being of a different sex, but of an entirely different species. The strange entity is approached warily, like a fierce or coy animal, not like a fellow-human. The ideas, interests, habits of mind, are so diverse that to find a common meeting-ground is hopeless. And the sense of aloofness and unfamiliarity in the sphere of soul and intellect depresses what intercourse there is to a lower plane, and leads to the rash formation of “snatch” unions, so to speak, the Dead Sea fruit of a momentary impulse or a mistaken fancy. Add to this the prejudices and conventions of society, which forbid these two foreign and *farouches* denizens of two alien planets to associate on terms of anything approaching to intimacy without malicious aspersions or embarrassing innuendoes, and it becomes plain that radical and far-reaching social reform is required before such a consummation as a true human marriage can be expected to take place oftener than once or twice in a decade. And, hopelessly debarred from beginning at the right end—the communion of spirit, the community of interest, the fellowship and friendship of heart and understanding which make “the sequel pure”—our youths and maidens blunder and flounder into ignoble and unequal wedlock, and,

“Beginning at the sequel, know no more.”

In its character of a religious ordinance, conventional marriage strikes the reformers as being altogether out of harmony with the best thought of the age. In proportion as their view of marriage has become nobler, a ceremony which, like the Church of England marriage service, thrusts into prominence that which, with all refined, self-respecting, reverent, and humane minds, constitutes the “sequel,” bolstering up the old degrading Catholic fallacy that whereas virginity is blessed, marriage is expedient merely—jars and estranges them. Still more emphatically do they repudiate the view taken in the Anglican “Form of Solemnization of Matrimony” of the mutual relations of husband and wife. That which the law has done and still does with the perhaps excusable cynicism of a secular power, they shudder to see the priest doing, with the sanction, as he believes, of the All-just and All-merciful—relegating, that is, one of the adult contracting parties, whose hands and lives he is joining, to a position of acknowledged

inferiority, of perpetual nonage, and of humiliating subjection. If they deprecate the "religious" service which, contemplating the "causes for which matrimony was ordained," places last, as a mere after-thought, instead of first, with overwhelming honours, the primary cause, "the mutual society, help and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other;" if they recoil from the service which, on the ignorant assumption that marriage is "a remedy against sin," deliberately encourages legalized iniquity, such as cannot here be specified in the terms which are alone appropriate to it;¹ not less sternly, less indignantly, do they reject a service which, in the name of God, Religion, Church, affixes the seal of sanctity to the despotic rule of the man, while it affixes the stigma of slavery for evermore on the brow of the woman. The words "obedience," "submission," "reverence," "subjection," again and again repeated in the exhortations to the wife; the weak and illogical recommendations to the husband to "worship" and "honour" the person whom he is all the while implicitly enjoined to treat as the most despicable object in creation—a grown-up child, or, the most pitiable—a semi-idiot—these blots on the Church's formal exposition of the responsibilities attaching to marriage are the more repugnant to believers in Justice, in Liberty, and in Love, that they are the conscientious handiwork of believers in God. And the more sacramental marriage has become, for such, the more sacrilegious does "religion" appear in its purblind efforts to cleanse what is defiled with a ceremony, to consecrate what is unworthy with a formula, and to perpetuate what is barbaric with a quotation from St. Paul. "Men have still to learn," says a high authority on the physiological as well as the ethical aspect of the matter, "that women do not give themselves in marriage, but take the man in marriage. The radical heresy which has prevailed from St. Paul onward, must be persistently and unflinchingly combated. The Catholic Church, which has so logically formulated this sexual heresy, still holds the Protestant world in subjection to it." And, thoroughly convinced of the truth of this assertion, the marriage reformers, whatever their private religious beliefs, are prepared to do battle on the lines laid down in it for a marriage ceremony, which shall be genuinely religious in the sense of being just and equal and righteous, pure and elevated and spiritual.

But between this attitude of mind and the attitude of mind which, because a particular ceremony displeases, scorns ceremony altogether, or because legal bonds may be formal or unequal, will have no legal tie at all; or because certain social practices are barbaric and corrupt, would blindly substitute other practices even more suggestive of backward stages, long ago sloughed by the higher types of mankind—between these two ways of looking at the marriage

¹ See Mrs. Caird's article, "Marriage;" WESTMINSTER REVIEW for August, p. 192

question there is an impassable chasm. The distinction is a vital one, and cannot be insisted upon too strongly or defined too clearly. The position of the marriage-reformers, briefly stated, is this. While yielding to no marriage-rejector of them all in impatience of effete laws, in repugnance for obsolescent customs, in hostility to irrelevant ecclesiastical pretensions, they are, at the same time, unalterably fixed in their resolve to allow no tampering with the principle of legal marriage itself—that is, with the solemn official ratification by the State of the life-choice of every man and woman whom, in the present, impulse or interest—in the future, as they trust, ever more and more Love only—have joined together.

It is now time to endeavour briefly to reply to the question, On which side is the truth, or, more accurately, the larger proportion of truth? Are those who repudiate marriage altogether, or those who desire to modify it, in the right? Will the deliberate verdict of the future be given in favour of marriage-rejection or of marriage-reform? Enough has probably been said to show that, in the opinion of the present writer, the marriage-reformers have incomparably the stronger case. We have seen that the rupture of both divisions with traditional conceptions of the institution has its roots in a noble discontent, and is, in the main, indicative, not of anarchy and disorder, but of progress towards a higher form of monogamic union. With both the motive for revolt has been detestation of the spirit which still exalts the “union by law” over the “union by affection,” and both are alike characterized by a fine human perception of what it is which alone constitutes marriage, and by a laudable resolve that the essence of the marriage bond shall not continue to be subordinated to the form. But, in the illustrations taken almost at random from recent literature of the modern tendency to marriage-rejection, we have also seen what are the inevitable consequences of the total surrender of the legal contract. “When we do not love any more, we can say good-bye,” says Miss Schreiner’s heroine. “Love should have the birthright of his wings,” says Mr. Austin’s hero. Why should two persons be bound together for life? asks Mr. Karl Pearson; and why, asked an anonymous writer, evidently of weight, not long since in the columns of a newspaper, should not temporary connections be formed, *sans peur et sans reproche*, by mutual consent of adult persons who prefer them to the restrictions of marriage? Instances might be multiplied indefinitely, but the foregoing are sufficient to show that, however unimpeachable the central principle of the marriage-rejectors may be—the principle, namely, that it is love which is the essence of marriage—the corollaries they draw from it are perilously unsound, whether regarded from the point of view of individual morality, of the furtherance of the commonweal, or of the progress of the race towards the true sexual relation. It may be conceded at once that in an ideal community—a Utopia where every man and every

woman should be instinctively prudent in choice and unalterably constant in devotion—the marriage-contract, like every other binding agreement entered into for purposes of less moment, might be abolished without harm. But even in such a community—even in a community where the word of every citizen, without exception, should be as good as his bond, where fraud and dishonour should be unknown, and where there should be no occasion to take count of a disorderly and unscrupulous minority—even here it is scarcely conceivable that a step of such supreme importance to the State as well as to the individual as marriage should ever be permitted to become a private and personal matter merely. Because, in such a community no unions would, *ex hypothesi*, be made, but “unions by affection;” because in a society composed entirely of men and women of honour and probity, deception and desertion, neglect of parental responsibilities, and so forth, would be unheard of, it would not follow that an act so tremendous as the embarking upon a permanent and exclusive life-partnership would ever cease to be a public act, performed “before God and this company”—sanctioned by the State, and attested by a cloud of witnesses. The sheer momentousness of the step—unless we are to assume conditions of existence and of character totally opposed to our present knowledge and really unimaginable—would demand a public function of corresponding solemnity; the very laws of expression—quite apart from the question of legal obligations—would seem to require an office of a sacramental character, a majestic outward utterance of a transcendent spiritual experience.

So much for an ideal future. But as things are, and as things are likely for scores of generations to remain, making every possible allowance for the beneficent operation of all civilizing and humanizing agencies, and assuming a rate of moral progress considerably more rapid than the past warrants, what rashness, what recklessness, does this trifling with legal marriage appear! What blindness does it appear not to see that, in the actual state of society, to throw discredit upon marriage is not to progress, but to relapse, by leaps and bounds, into bygone levels of civilization—not to enthrone something higher than marriage, but to put a premium on all the less noble, the less stable instincts, and to let loose those forces of disorder which—until the millennium—will always form the grim and menacing background of individual and of collective human life! The Lucifers, the Lyndalls, do not contemplate disorder; they contemplate a purified monogamy; but out of their own mouth they are condemned. While genuinely aspiring to what is progressive, they are, in practice, we find, inculcating what is barbaric; we find on their lips the very doctrines of “free love;” we find in their hearts—perhaps unconsciously to themselves—a latent disbelief in

"lasting choice," a secret conviction that if Love is to retain "the birthright of his wings," it is that he may use them.

And, if we turn to the practical, as distinguished from the theoretical rejectors of marriage; if we turn to those courageous pioneers—so they have deemed themselves—who have dared to shape their lives in accordance with this modern tendency to disparage the legal bond, and have, as it were on principle, defied opinion and eschewed marriage—what do we find? We find, in one word—failure. We find long periods of inward questioning and conflict; grave crises of remorse and resolves of lifelong expiation; we find suffering which is not quite the hallowed suffering of the martyr to truth; finally, we find confession of error, made sometimes in a very practical way. A typical instance will occur at once in the domestic history of one whose attitude towards the marriage-tie has done more to unsettle the morality (in the technical sense) of our time than it is easy to state without the appearance of exaggeration. The details of that history we do not know—perhaps we never shall know; the above may not be in every particular an accurate picture of the mental experience of the great novelist whose works have influenced her generation only less profoundly than her personal example is influencing it; but we are probably justified in inferring from the meagre public records which exist that, in outline at least, it represents something not far from the truth. George Eliot, it is evident to those who read between the lines of the *Life*, made a solemn resolve that the teachings of her books should more than countervail the stumbling-block afforded by the spectacle of her irregular union, and should show, indirectly, that although her principles of action might be beyond the grasp of her contemporaries, at least they were not incompatible with an exalted sense of right, and a well-nigh fanatic devotion to duty. Unfortunately, the pathetic enterprise has failed of its effect. It is the lesson of the life—not of the writings—that is easiest learned in these days of ruthless publicity, and of the rigid, logical determination to estimate men and women not by what they preach, but by what they are; and it is obviously the behaviour of George Eliot herself rather than the behaviour of her creations—of Dinah or Romola or Dorothea or Fedalma—which is moulding the ethical views of, at least, the younger section of her disciples. That she saw and lamented her error, that her writings deprecate it, that her painful clinging throughout life to the terms "husband," "wife," was an indirect admission of it, and her marriage, as life was closing, a final recantation of it—all this is less apparent to many than the fact that in earlier days she, the pure, the lofty, ay, the religious moralist, regarded the legal ceremony with indifference. Time and experience alone can counteract the fatal impulse imparted by her to the anti-marriage doctrines of the day. That they will counteract it those

are bound to believe who hold that marriage-reform, not marriage-rejection, must be the note of any progress which deserves the name; that the legal ceremony, so far from being repudiated, must be increasingly held in honour with the spread of moral enlightenment; and that the thesis of Kant will become ever more and more axiomatic: No union between the sexes is permissible, "except subject to the conditions of a particular legal contract (marriage) in which event two persons become mutually obliged to one another."

A word in conclusion upon the subject of divorce. "Increased facilities for obtaining a divorce," according to Mr. Herbert Spencer, already suggest coming "reprobation of marital relations in which the union by affection has been dissolved"—that is to say, the marriage of the future, or whatever may be its equivalent, will not merely arise out of affection, but will cease the moment that affection ceases. Love, if Mr. Spencer's forecast be correct, is on the high-road to being formally endowed with the birthright of his wings. We are, to be sure, consoled with the reflection that by the time this state of things is reached, other changes will, *pari passu*, have taken place which will minimize its dangers. "The higher sentiments accompanying union of the sexes," which have been slowly maturing throughout the ages, may, we are reminded, "be expected to develop still more. . . . So that the changes which may further facilitate divorce under certain conditions, are changes which will make those conditions more and more rare." Ill-assorted unions, we are presumably to understand, will seldom take place; conjugal tragedies will be of less frequent occurrence; permanent marriage will be a habit, and a tender loyalty an instinct.

All this may be true, and yet it may also be true that divorce is, in principle, incompatible with the true monogamic idea, and will be viewed with less favour as the higher sentiments develop and mankind advances towards the human marriage ideal. Already there are signs of reaction against the divorce mania which, in some countries, threatens the actual existence of the family, and makes marriage a byword. The truth is being forced upon us that divorce means practically the relief of the few at the expense of the well-being of the many—the sacrifice of the State (which exists through the family) to the personal comfort of individuals. The modern spirit of revolt under discomfort, of impatience of suffering—even when notoriously self-caused—has hitherto blinded us to the clear duty of enduring private misfortune in the interest of the community, as well as to the madness of resorting to legal remedies for ills which only the gradual education of the race to nobler conceptions of its sex-relations can legitimately remove. While this education is proceeding, it is obvious that individuals will suffer, and suffer grievously. But that is the ineludible law of progress. And the sum of misery will probably be less where men and women are accustomed to regard

marriage as indissoluble than where its dissolubility at will fosters the more frivolous—too often the more criminal—forms of passion. It is scarcely conceivable that in a future which we are led to believe will differ happily from the present in the rarity of its loveless unions, the few will not learn altruism enough to acquiesce in their personal privations rather than risk the stability of what—in a profounder sense than the world has known as yet—they will regard as the sacrament of marriage. Is it not Tolstoi who, in his re-statement of the “second commandment” of Jesus, has uttered the watchword of the future? “Let every man have one wife and every woman one husband. No libertinage and no divorce.”

ELIZABETH RACHEL CHAPMAN.

COMPULSORY EMIGRATION.

To any one dwelling in the quietude of colonial life it becomes of great interest to watch from afar the ebullition of social movement in England; involuntarily the bystander wonders if there is not "hell-broth" in that seething caldron. The cry, that the motive power which causes the riots and Socialist meetings which have lately taken place, has its origin in an effort of the criminal classes to provoke temporary disorder, is an explanation which deceives no one except those who wish to be deceived: a very natural curiosity filling the mind, not on the question whether some great trouble will or will not happen, but as to *when* it will happen. The regiments of Life Guards and divisions of police, with which the political safety-valve is weighted, fail to gain a high degree of confidence to those who regard the State machinery with unprejudiced eyes. As one of many thousands in the Colonies who love England well, and do not wish to see the great principle of Imperial policy thwarted by any "disease of the heart" of the Empire, I may, perhaps, be pardoned for attempting to show a possible way in which danger may be averted.

Given, a limited area and a continually increasing population, what is the remedy against poverty, growing into disorder, and tending to catastrophe? I can see but two courses possible to follow: one is Malthusianism, the other Emigration. Of Malthusianism I shall say little; it is a subject beset with prejudices of many kinds, and indeed is only fitted for the guidance of men under the control of reason, a condition to which the mass of mankind are far from having attained. That a man who, on a fixed wage, is struggling hard to keep a wife and one or two children, should become poverty-stricken when he has half a dozen more infants to provide with food and clothing, seems to me a proposition perfectly incontrovertible; nor do I understand why somewhat of that sexual abstinence which is exalted into a virtue for unmarried persons should be considered as contemptible for a wedded pair. As this, the only effectual mode of touching the question of over-population is practically "out of court," I will consider the alternative (in itself a temporary palliative), that of emigration.

"The Norse drop in his veins" is the explanation one constantly

hears given concerning the roving habits of Englishmen. This does not affect his colonizing tendencies, because that roving drop in the blood of Britain's sea-kings brought them home again after their long journeyings across the foam. Something more is needed to explain the reason why home, friends, almost all that makes life valuable, is left behind, and the uncertainties of a novel existence in a foreign country encountered. The reason, stern and unpoetical, is that, in the majority of cases, the colonist has been starved out of the mother country. Sufficient has been left to him of means whereby he may undertake the journey, and the result, in almost every instance, is comparative success. There is left behind him, however, a vast multitude, who either have not the means to emigrate, or lack the knowledge of the good to be gained thereby; and this multitude of the unwise and the unhappy produces the social ferment which we call "disorder among the dangerous classes." While conceding that they are the dangerous classes (that is, to owners of property), we must not forget the immense latent power for good which lies within them; this misdirected potency being acknowledged even by the fear of their ability to do mischief. If, by changing the environment, we can turn these dangerous atoms of society into constituents whereby the body politic can be nourished, surely the effort, even if it has to be a gigantic effort, is worthy of trial. It may seem trivial to use such a well-worn argument as a plea for emigration, but the gist is in the expression, "a gigantic effort," and it is of this that I wish to speak. However successful colonization has been in regard to results achieved, the scanty dribbling outflow in the past has failed to remove the peril caused by the plethora of human beings in Great Britain. Can a greater or more systematic effort be made? Whither shall the stream flow? I believe that the attempt must one day be made, at any cost; and the direction I would point out is towards the beautiful untrodden lands of the South Sea Islands.

Before describing the fitness of the Pacific islands as a home for the sons and daughters of England, I will treat on the practicability of the arrangement of "compulsory colonies." The idea which will suggest itself to every reader at first is that any compulsion for such a purpose would be a direct infringement of the liberty of the subject and the rights of citizenship. That there would be a temporary curtailment of such rights is certain, but there is the old choice only, between a lesser evil and a greater. What rights does the man who cannot earn sufficient food in England possess, except the rights either to starve or to be supported by the industry of others? Individual liberty is, even now, curbed in many directions, made subsidiary to the more urgent demand for the benefit of the whole community. If this compulsion of the individual should be so far extended as to force him, when he cannot obtain work or

bread, to remove himself to some place where labour is needed and food plentiful, such pressure would not seem altogether unjustifiable. With all that modern science has done for the prolongation of life and the preservation of the weakly, this "survival of the unfittest" proves itself a small boon to that portion of our race with whom life has become a curse instead of a blessing, and the feeble are left to cumber the arms and entangle the footsteps of men fighting madly for bread.

If I wished to push my proposal to the extreme, I would suggest that certain over-populated parishes or districts should be "proclaimed," and the inhabitants removed to far-off colonies. This course I do not pretend to advocate: although, if I wished to do so, I might cite at least one historical example in the British Isles: that of the removal of the Highlanders by whole tribes to the bleak shores of Nova Scotia. That course, which was permitted by law to be taken at the whim of individual landowners (whose title to the tribal lands was very doubtful), may be pleaded as an excuse for discussing a possible like action as a State necessity in the time of great national danger. The course I would suggest is, that a semi-compulsory formation of colonial settlements be considered, based on the following lines: although, if the idea be entertained, the details could be widely amended. A Parliamentary Commission should be appointed, with powers to investigate (by many sub-committees) and report upon the condition of the densely crowded centres; then to draft out all those individuals and families (keeping parishes or districts together) whose net earnings fall below a financial zero at which it is possible to provide good and sufficient nourishment. The Commission would work hand in hand with the police, avoiding all unnecessary offensive publicity. When the complement of persons sufficient to form the labour-stratum of the new colony had been decided on and secured, arrangements should be made for attracting a certain number of men (with decided preference for those with families), having trades and professions: so many butchers, bakers, shipwrights, engineers, &c., as would seem desirable. To these some weekly or monthly remuneration should be offered towards their subsistence, beyond what they may acquire by practice of their trades and professions. In all cases, both of skilled and unskilled labour, provision would have to be made to secure their sustentation and their tuition in the new work of colonial life, for the first few years. To a higher class still, a greater inducement should be held out—viz., the honours and dignities appertaining to the administration of governmental and departmental offices, in the wider field opened for their intellectual energies on unbroken ground; they being relieved from the pressure of their own class competing (as in every other class) for the few prizes obtainable. Although much of the prejudice in the minds of English workmen against the Austra-

lian colonies is dying away, thanks to the spread of education and the efforts of the public press, there can be no doubt that the manner in which some of these colonies were formed by convict settlement has had a most deterrent effect upon immigration hither. The notion of being what he calls "transported" to the colonies, or even of being cast out like workhouse refuse, is insupportable to the badly nourished but independent-minded labourer. Could he see his "betters," the men to whom he has looked up all his life, going with him to redeem the wilderness, the feeling of pariahship would disappear, and he would be easily reconciled. The ancient colonies were thus formed, by a sort of semi-compulsion (many of them as military settlements, Roumania being an example of success)—at all events, under political pressure, which, whether exercised by the will of a monarch or of a democracy, sent out men of all classes, and did not depend on the dribbling leakage of population overflow.

The drafting out of thousands of families, their removal to distant lands, and the nursing of the new colonies at the outset, would necessitate the expenditure of a large sum of money. This fund cannot be raised except under the pressure of full conviction of a great danger imminent. If that danger should be acknowledged, and an effort made to neutralize it, the money must be raised by a "forced loan" on capital and income; probably amounting to an insignificant percentage on the immense wealth of England, and only justifiable on the plea of temporarily ceding a part lest the whole should be imperilled when entrusted to the tender mercies of the "red flag." Temporary, because the money so invested, increased tenfold, would return to the mother-country by countless channels. "The trade follows the flag"—say rather, "follows the tongue." With every colony planted by Englishmen, bearing the certainty of success within it from the fact of being so planted by the race of unfailing colonists, the political as well as the commercial influence of Britain is widened. There is no link of fraternity so close as that of common speech and common ancestry: although the fierce fighting of England and America in the War of Independence may seem to offer an example to the contrary, no one can be with English and Americans in the society of foreigners without being impressed by the fact that communication which needs no interpreter between the speakers constitutes a bond of union which makes the flag flying overhead a matter of small importance. While considering the financial side of the question, we must not forget that there would be a gain in the avoidance of much present loss through "strikes," &c. When mills and costly machinery stand idle week after week, not only are the workmen, by dragging out existence on the pay from trades unions, "eating the head off" the wages gained in the days of employment, but capital is devouring itself and has no sheaves to show at eventide. That which can remove

the cause of strife between employer and employed will be a blessing for both capital and labour; the slight rise in wages being balanced by the greater security of property, the lessened poor-rate, the new markets opened across the seas, and the free breathing-room for those who are left behind. There are few instances in history where the wealth or power of a great nation has been lessened by the sending out of her swarms to hive afar.

The proposal to remove the inhabitants of whole parishes in overcrowded centres, and an attempt to keep together (at any cost) the members of families, must be considered also as affecting beneficially the social question as it regards the present numerical inequality of the sexes. The process of colonization as it has been hitherto carried out has had the result of causing a steady exodus of men, and mostly of young and able-bodied men. The brothers leave their sisters behind, and the effect is shown, not only by the statistical accounts of the overplus of women, but, to the observant eye, in many ways cruel to notice. One of these is the compulsory entrance of women into competition with men in the fields of business and labour; each successful female competition, by ousting a male breadwinner, destroying the chance of another woman obtaining a home and the protection of marriage. Could the girls of a family accompany the boys to the foreign home, the surplus of males noticeable in young colonies would disappear, and the disappointed or overworked women of elder communities lose their importance as factors in the State question. Much of the hardship to the men would also be ameliorated could they carry with them the refining influences of home life. It is difficult for any English person, who knows England only, to understand the desolation of soul, the weary exile-feeling, which comes upon a young emigrant who leaves behind him relatives, friends, books, flowers, music, &c., and is condemned to the solitude, mental and physical, in which the years pass over him on the wide plains of Australia or in the vast forests of New Zealand. As the colony becomes more thickly peopled, the solitude disappears, and a culture evolves itself which adorns the outer husk of life; but if that state of society, which the course of many generations has produced in England, could be introduced at the very beginning of a new settlement, there would be the gain of a century to the young nation's intellectual progress, and the sum of happiness to the individual be enormously increased. I have never yet spoken on the subject to any colonist who did not acknowledge that for the first year or two the desire to return to the home country was very great; but, as the days went on, he learnt, if not to forget the old, to love the new land passing well. Thus it is that, as a necessary, though seemingly hard, measure of restriction, under "compulsory emigration," I would not allow of the return or absence from the colony for the first few years (say three) of any of the new settlers, except

under permission, difficult to obtain, from those having control of public affairs; then only in matters of life and death, or involving great interests.

That those inhabitants of our colonies who are not capitalists would object to the introduction of special settlements composed of men immigrating compulsorily is certain; nor do I think that such communities could be introduced into districts already peopled without grave injustice. The reduction of the rate of wages which would be caused by competition with men accustomed to work at starvation rates would introduce a state of affairs similar to that left at home, and would be a wrong to those who have, unassisted, borne the burden and heat of the early colonial day. But in the British colonies there are great tracts of unoccupied land, which could be obtained for small sums from the respective governments, where an isolation more or less brief could be enforced until the newcomers were fitted to share the ordinary work and rewards of the general population. It is, however, not to colonies already formed that I believe the movement should be directed, but to new and untried lands. Of these there are many in Asia, Africa, and America, eminently suitable for occupation; the difficulties in the way of acquiring them, and there rearing flourishing communities, being only difficulties which Englishmen would meet to overcome. The most desirable direction for the stream to take is, in my opinion, towards the islands of the South Seas.

That emigration, whether voluntary, semi-voluntary, or wholly compulsory, would find in the Pacific islands a magnificent field for enterprise, there can be small room for doubt.

Little is known of these islands by the working bees of England, except that they are far away, and that they are inhabited by savages. The question of the distance is nothing in these days of fleet steamers, the "ocean greyhounds"; the savages are a mere burden of the imagination. The Polynesian islanders are, in very few cases, the equals of their brothers in New Zealand, so far as their fighting proclivities are concerned; and we Europeans find it perfectly possible to live here with the few Maori inhabitants in the most perfect goodwill and brotherhood, now that we understand each other, and the power of mischief-makers has been destroyed. Arrangements of the most satisfactory character could be easily made with the natives of those South Sea islands which are populated. The Melanesians and Papuans are more difficult peoples to deal with, but consideration, firmness, and kindness win their way in New Guinea or Fiji as well as in Rarotonga or Hawaii; the experiment might be confined to the thousand islands of the Polynesians proper for a long time. To the educated reader the mention of the islands brings recollection of Byron's beautiful description in his poem of "The Island," and, still better known, the lines of the Laureate:—

- "Larger constellations burning, mellow moons and happy skies,
Breadths of tropic shade and palms in cluster, knots of paradise.
- "Never comes the trader, never floats the European flag,
Slides the bird o'er lustrous woodland, hangs the trailer from the crag.
- "Droops the heavy-blossomed flower, hangs the heavy-fruited tree,
Summer isles of Eden lying in dark purple spheres of sea."

This conception is a wonderfully faithful one, only failing in the utter inadequacy of words to depict the loveliness of some of these "isles of Eden." To turn from the inspired lines of the poet to the prose of one who was (alas! *was*) better acquainted with the Pacific, its islands and its islanders, than perhaps any other person has been, I will quote a few words¹ in illustration of the feelings enjoyed by those in occupation of the islands concerning the beautiful home which awaits the enterprising voyager. As these lands were at the beginning of the century, so are they to-day, practically unvisited and uncolonized:—

"There is a charm about this kind of occupation (*bêche-de-mer* fishing) which the dwellers in the Babel of civilization might be at a loss to comprehend—an elasticity of spirits arising from the consciousness of perfect liberty and absolute release from all conventional restraint, a total oblivion of all debts and duties, and entire exemption from any form of mental anxiety. There is a certain amount of reason in this. To spend one's days in a rock-bound haven, where the waters are eternally at rest, no matter what storms may raise the sea which rolls outside the coral barrier; to run about barefoot upon silvery sands, where the cool sea-breeze all the year round conquers the sultriness of the tropic sunshine; to paddle about upon the still waters of a calm lagoon, whose limpid waves display beneath them an infinity of strange and beautiful forms; to sleep softly and to dream sweetly, sung to rest by the ceaseless sounding of the distant sea and rustling of the night-wind among the feathery palms; to know nothing of what is going on in the outer world, and to care as little; to have no ideas beyond those included within the horizon of vision; to climb to the summit of some lofty tree, and to see at one glance all which constitutes for ourself the material universe—to wit, a calm, green lake, a circlet of verdant islets and snow-white sandy beaches, a coral reef bathed in a sheet of dazzling foam, and, outside of all, the vast circle of the restless ocean, more intensely blue from contrast with the cloudless sky, with nothing to relieve its monotony but, maybe, the rainbow spume of some spouting whalefish, or the glancing pinions of the lone sea birds. . . . Let us take, for instance, the incidents of one day on some desert isle like Gaspar Rico, Peregrino, or Palmerston. Beginning with the dark hour just before the dawn, the stars are shining with an intense brilliancy, reflected on the steel-bright surface of the calm lagoon. The sandy pathways seem like snow. The heavy forest of towering palms, and banyans, interlocked with trailing vines, assumes weird and fantastic shapes, and shows a black outline against the clear blue sky; under their dark shadows twinkle innumerable points of light, the lamps of great glowworms and luminous grubs. The trade wind moans among the forest leaves, and mingles its music with the hollow roar of the surf that rolls upon the coral reef. There are sounds of life, too, in the sombre shades—a sound from time to

¹ This quotation is taken from a report on the South Sea Islands, by H. B. Sterndale, for the New Zealand Government, in 1884. To avoid notes, and citing many different but comparative authors, I quote Sterndale only in this paper.

time as of blows with a pickaxe. In such a spot one might imagine it to be pirates who delve for hidden treasure, or murderers digging graves; but it is the 'knovin,' the 'uguvalé' (the great land-crab of the desert isles)—he is breaking a cocon-nut for his morning meal. When the grey dawn glimmers in the east, the sea-birds flap their wings, and cry one to another from the lofty boughs. As the light increases, they quit their roosts, and fly away to seek their living on the sea. They go swiftly and in long lines dead to windward, for they know that when they return they will be weary and loaded with fish for their young ones, so they will want a fair wind home. Presently evidences of human existence become apparent in the solitude. Amongst a little cluster of palm-leaf huts breaks forth a gabbling of tongues, and dusky figures carrying glowing fire-brands pass from one dwelling to another. Men in the costume of the Grecian statues, and women half-covered by their hair, trot down the sandy pathways to bathe in the cold lagoon. They meet others by the way, and exchange civilities: 'Tena Korua!' 'Eke ouli Kaina;' they make no remark about the weather; it is not their habit, the seasons undergo so little change in these blessed latitudes. When the glorious sun rises over the sea and lights up the woodland with his golden beams, there is a sound of axes in the forest: the men are cutting logs to keep up the fires beneath their smoking fish. Then the women uncover the Maori ovens, and spread out the "kai" rolled up in palm-leaves and nicely done brown; fishes of all sorts, and fat cockles, and gannets' eggs, and perhaps a great turtle baked in his armour, and huge land-crabs, and roasted nuts, and many good things. When all have eaten, they stow away what remains, and wash up the dishes while the men collect their gear, knives, and baskets, and fish spears, and lines, and gourds of water. One or two remain at home to watch the smoking, and by the time the sun is level with the crown of the palms, the rest launch the boat and spread the tall brown sail, and steer for some distant cay or coral shoal, where they spend the day in light labour, which is to them mere sport, tumbling about like nereids in the clear, cool water, wandering about upon the mossy reef, laughing and skylarking as they gather the slimy slug and spear the fish among the stones; until early in the afternoon, when they return to their little settlement, where some clean and cook the *bêche-de-mer*, while the rest go to providing food. And by the time they get their suppers it is night; then they make fires and spread mats between them, and lie down and tell tales of phantom ships, and of ghosts and tupakos, and of impossible adventures and voyages to wonderful islands, and they sing songs, and the musician plays upon the pandean pipes and a shark-skin drum, and they get up and dance upon the smooth white sand by the light of the broad white moon until the night is far spent, when they all go to rest, to awake again at dawn with the sea-birds—just as happy and as innocent in their lives as they.'

A beautiful picture of free, buoyant life: it seems almost desecration to place such portraiture of what man once was beside the terrible scenes which meet our gaze in the overcrowded dens of "civilized" towns; but, alas! the kindly, handsome race of the fair Polynesian is passing away. To whom shall their heritage fall?

But beauty, important as it is to true mental culture, is not the most weighty consideration in regard to a field for colonization. The first question to be answered is in regard to the climate. "Can Englishmen live and work there?" The reply is, that these islands, although they extend their groups over many degrees of latitude, are in most cases under a warmer sun than that to which Britons are

accustomed in their own home ; but not too hot for Europeans to dwell under in health and comfort. They will be able to labour for themselves—

“not exactly as at present the case at Atimoana and Moorea, where Chinese coolies and Kingsmill savages have been imported in swarms, but a European race will establish themselves upon the land, who will perform their own labour with their own hands. They will not be the sickly sort of Papalangis, whom one sees now generally throughout Polynesia on mission and trading stations, who have reduced themselves to a state of chronic dyspepsia by persisting in European habits of food and living (ignoring the fact of their utter unsuitability to the dwellers in the torrid zone), or who kill their livers with alcohol and then lay the blame on the climate ; but men healthy, powerful, bronzed, and hardy, accustomed to paddle their own canoe, not afraid to look the blazing sun in the face, to plunge into the foam of a breaker, or make their way to land on a surf-beaten shore ; such men as Jeff Strickland at Aitutaki, William Masters of Palmerston, Eli Jennings of Quiros Isle, Harry Williams of Manihiki, George Bicknell of Fannings Island, and a very great proportion of the “beach-combers” who have scattered themselves over the face of the whole coral sea. These men are not emaciated, pale, liver-disordered, or enervated by the heat of the climate. They are stalwart, smart, and lively. They have strength to lift a kedg-anchor, and to carry two hundred cocoa-nuts upon their shoulders out of the forests in the heat of the day (and they do it). They climb trees like apes, and dive for shell-fish to feed their families. They wear no shoes, but go barefooted at all times on beaches of sharp gravel and reefs of prickly coral. They gather *bêche-de-mer*, or chop wood for whaling ships all through the long tropic day. Some of these men have as many as twenty children, with huge frames and gipsy countenances. Their sons are like bronze statues, their daughters models of beauty and strength. . . . The advantage is that of a climate beyond every other conducive to health and longevity ; a perpetual summer of so delightful a temperature that working men of Europe or the Australias may there devote themselves to a life of pleasant and profitable labour without inconvenience or detriment to their constitutions. In proof of this, the traveller may see, at any time, in the Navigators and other islands within a few degrees of the equator, Englishmen from Australia and New Zealand felling timber in forests and stripping it into planks in saw-pits without sheds or roofs to protect them from the sunshine. They do not complain of the heat, and they seldom suffer from sickness, not being more liable to it there than elsewhere. Had the islands of the Caribbean Sea possessed these conditions they would have formed—at least a hundred years ago—a congeries of prosperous States, peopled by communities of happy, independent, hard-working Europeans, instead of being regarded, from their insufferable sultriness and the deadly miasma carried from the neighbouring continent, as the graves of white men.”

The fertile, teeming soil is now comparatively uncultivated : the few and simple articles coveted by natives being obtained from the far-between visits of traders, in exchange for pearls, sandal-wood, cocoa-nuts, *bêche-de-mer*, &c. There can be no motive for uncivilized men to till ground where food grows in almost inconceivable abundance : in some of the islands a man needs only to labour for a single day in order to plant sufficient food-supplies to support his family and himself through the whole year. It may perhaps be urged that this fatal facility in procuring food will be the downfall of

the new colony : that, like the "soul-destroying potato," the yams, taro, bread-fruit, &c., so easily grown, will do away with the incentive to exertion, and bring about the early decay of the settlement. There is no real reason for believing that such decay will be a necessary consequence of the fertility of the soil and the beauty of the climate. When we consider that a great cause of the social uneasiness which I mentioned at the commencement of this paper is produced by hunger, it seems hard to believe that men of our race would rest idly, and not cultivate a vast supply of food-producing plants, the exportation of which would stifle the famine-cry in far-off cities, and at the same time bring opulence to the husbandman, if, by his own physical exertions, he could win his way to fortune—fortune, not only by producing the common necessities of life, but by the cultivation of valuable crops, such as coffee, cotton, indigo, sugar, tamarinds, tobacco, vanilla, manihot (tapioca), sago, arrowroot, spices, &c. ; an endless number of which could be enumerated as fitted for the climate and the soil. The food I mentioned as growing so prolifically is merely native food ; the yams, bananas, plantains, and bread-fruit occupying places hereafter to be filled with more valuable vegetation. I fear there will be little inducement in the native food, however plentiful, to emigrants who believe in a paradise of roast beef three times a day—those who are able to revel in unbounded flesh-diet will be able to stay at home, but for them no compulsory emigration is needed. They would certainly be unable for some time to get much beef and mutton in the South Sea settlements, although some of the islands are of large size, and do not resemble the coral atoll generally delineated in pictures of "A Pacific Island." On some of the larger islands a great variety of climate can be secured : the heat of the coast being modified as one rises towards the higher land of the interior ; in others, the different aspects (mainly as windward and leeward—in the steady trade-winds) have varying degrees of humidity and temperature. In regard to diet, one in which meat is largely indulged in would be unsuitable, and much too gross for these latitudes, where the more closely the habit of eating vegetable food can be adhered to (on which the natives have reared their well-made bodies for centuries) the better. The craving for meat dies away after continued residence ; but, if found absolutely indispensable, the colonies could be easily supplied from Australia, New Zealand, or America, with frozen meat, in a far cheaper manner than by attempting to rear animals locally. These, however, are mere details, and would arrange themselves without difficulty.

A reason, as yet unurged, for these islands soon being taken possession of by Europeans, is that another race is making a slow but steady advance in this direction. In the Sandwich Islands, while the natives are growing fewer year by year, the Chinese already

number many thousands ; they are obtaining footing in several of the other groups, and it may not be long before the question is settled for us in the wrong way. One of the best of our colonial writers and thinkers, Mr. E Wakefield, has shown, in his clever paper, that missionary enterprise in the Pacific has had a curious and unhappy effect : not the missionary work in itself, that being an undoubted good in removing much of the savagery formerly prevalent, but in the peace-making efforts of the missionaries rendering possible the arrival of the white men bearing with them an imperfect civilization, a semi-demi-civilization, in the presence of which the native race is fading away : the gentle, beautiful, heathen islanders, tractable and open to spiritual influences, passing, and being replaced by the "yellow agony" of paganism and Eastern Buddhism, inconvertible, intellectually intractable, and opposed to all traditions of Western progress. The Chinese have many good qualities—their industry, economy, &c., are well worthy of imitation ; but the Chinaman is no real colonist ; his home is China, to which, in life or death, he must return.

When the Panama Canal is finished, the light of a new day will dawn upon the Pacific islands. They, dotting the space of the great highway along which the trade of our Oriental and Australian possessions will pass to America, must not be allowed to pass into the hands of an alien race. The beautiful harbours, the fertile soil, the infinite possibilities which belong to the "isles of Eden" are the inheritance of those strong enough and wise enough to turn them to the best use ; and that best use would undoubtedly be the dispersal of overcrowded populations to fields of usefulness, fair in themselves, fairer in hope for our race.

EDWARD TREGGAR.

NEW ZEALAND.

1891.

THE NEXT GENERAL ELECTION: A FORECAST.

IN view of the striking transference of votes which has taken place in certain bye-elections which have occurred during the present year, and looking to the fact that those very elections have supplied us with reliable data from which to argue, we may, perhaps, find it worth while, within the necessarily circumscribed limits which such an article as this permits of, to endeavour to forecast what may reasonably be supposed to be the prospects of the Gladstonian party at the General Election which may not improbably occur at no very distant period.

Now, in estimating the probable chances of success of any political party at a general election, one naturally turns for inspiration to the results of recent bye-elections as affording a probable clue to the outcome of a more extended appeal to the constituencies. Much has been said in the past, and perhaps never more frequently than in the present, as to the untrustworthiness of any calculations based upon the results of bye-elections; but if this assertion be correct, and if bye-elections are misleading as an index of the direction in which public opinion is moving, then there are taken away from us the only available statistics from which to reason as to the feeling of the constituencies at large upon any of the great questions upon which a General Election may turn.

We do not propose to show how far the results of general elections which took place prior to the passing of the Franchise and Redistribution Acts of 1885 were correctly forecasted by bye-elections: to enter upon this question would be not only of little interest, but would also be comparatively useless, inasmuch as the conditions under which those bye-elections and general elections took place, are not the conditions under which elections take place at the present time. It is impossible to institute any comparison between the two periods, and it would, therefore, be absurd to argue that what has occurred in the past under one condition of affairs must necessarily occur in the future under quite another state of things.

When we say that the conditions are no longer the same, we mean that the electorate has been so altered by the passing of Mr. Gladstone's Franchise and Redistribution Acts, that it is no longer the same voice that now speaks at bye-elections that used to speak prior to 1885. It is a voice that speaks with more authority, for it speaks

for enlarged constituencies ; and it is a voice that speaks with greater freedom, inasmuch as, by reason of this very enlargement and redistribution of the electorate, the constituencies, whether borough or county, are no longer controlled by the great landowners, or to the same extent exposed to outside and undue influences. In past times, and particularly in the counties and smaller boroughs, the vote was nominally the vote of the electors, but the decision was practically the decision of the lord of the manor ! Prior to the passing of Mr. Gladstone's Redistribution Act, there were no fewer than 85 borough constituencies, each with an electorate of under 1500, and returning in the aggregate 88 members of Parliament. There were also 16 borough constituencies, each with an electorate of between 1500 and 2000, which were empowered to return 23 members of Parliament. In these days, then, no few than 111 members of Parliament were returned by boroughs so small as to be completely at the mercy of a few local wire-pullers acting in the interests of the magnate of the neighbourhood. In striking contrast to this state of things is the fact that at the present time there is but *one* borough with an electorate of under 2000, the borough possessing this unenviable singularity being that of Kilkenny (City), where the number of electors is only 1996. Looking to this fact, it seems almost past belief that there should ever have been a time when such hamlets as Portarlinton, with 142, and Ennis, with 247, of an electorate, each had the power to return a member of Parliament, and indeed that any constituency with an electorate of under 1000 or 1500 should have had a similar power, seems only less ridiculous than unjustifiable.

In most instances, bye-elections, prior to the passing of the Franchise and Redistribution Acts of 1885, cannot have been of very much value as political barometers, for, although a certain amount of liberty of action may have been accorded to voters in small boroughs and counties at bye-elections, it is nevertheless quite certain that at a general election, when more depended on the issue of the contest, the screw was remorselessly applied in order to compel at least a majority of the electors to give effect to the political convictions of the lord of the manor.

In how many cases could this be done at the present time, when all the little rotten boroughs and partially enfranchised counties, like the dodo, have utterly disappeared ? In how many instances can the great landowners now control the enlarged county constituencies, and how far can they hope to be successful in playing their old game of compelling the electors to stultify themselves by reversing at a general election the decision to which they had come at bye-elections ? These are questions which time alone can answer, but it is not unreasonable to assume that to a very large extent the influence of the lord of the manor has disappeared with the enlarge-

ment of the constituencies, and that, in consequence, bye-elections mean far more at the present time than ever they can have done in the past. It may, however, be argued that petty jealousies, local considerations, and other side issues will continue to obtrude themselves at bye-elections in a manner that they cannot do at a general election when the contest is waged upon a single, clearly defined issue; and thus it may come to pass that the verdict given by electors at bye-elections may be very different from that which they would give at a general election. We are quite ready to admit that there appears to be considerable force in this argument, only we would point out that it is an argument applicable to the past condition of things rather than to the present, because side issues were far more likely to influence the result of bye-elections in constituencies with a restricted electorate, such as existed previous to the passing of the Acts of 1885, than in the large constituencies which these very Acts have brought into existence. Looked at from this point of view, it may be supposed that bye-elections are at present more valuable as affording a test of popular feeling than they can ever have been at any previous period. Before passing from this topic to the consideration of the bye-elections which have recently taken place, we would call attention to the fact that, since the passing of the new Franchise and Redistribution Acts, we have had practically no opportunity given of judging how far bye-elections under the new condition of things can be regarded as affording a clue to the general political feeling of the country; for, although we have had two general elections in the redistributed and enfranchised constituencies, the time which elapsed between them was of too short duration to permit of almost any bye-elections taking place. All that we do for a certainty know is that the old order has changed, and we stand as it were on the threshold of a new political existence, wherein the lessons of the past cannot be accepted as guides for the future! In looking at the results of bye-elections which have occurred since the General Election of 1886, our attention is at once drawn to that which recently took place in the Ayr Burghs, because it was in that election that the Gladstonians achieved perhaps their greatest triumph in managing to break down an adverse majority of no less than 1175. Now this victory at Ayr, if indicative of nothing else, is certainly indicative of the fact that no seat can be considered absolutely safe which at last General Election showed a majority of less than 1200 votes for the successful candidate. Taking this fact into consideration, it appeared to us to be a matter of interest to discover how many seats were won at that election, and during the two years subsequently thereto, by majorities of under 1200 by either Ministerialists—under which denomination we class Unionist Liberals—or by the followers of Mr. Gladstone. In making this inquiry, we have not included any Irish constituency, because to do so would, in our opinion, be only a waste of time; for we all know that what

Ireland has done in the past she will continue to do in the future, and will almost to a certainty return not fewer than 85 Nationalists at any future general election. It may also be fairly assumed that the 18 Conservatives and Unionist Liberals, at present representing Irish constituencies, will not be diminished in number to any appreciable extent.

Assuming, therefore, that the political representation of Ireland will remain practically unchanged, we have omitted, as being irrelevant, and also of but little interest, the majorities by which seats were won in that country by Nationalists or Ministerialists at the last General Election. It will, then, be understood that England, Scotland, and Wales alone are under consideration.

The members representing these three countries in the Imperial Parliament amount in number to 567, and of this number, at the present moment, there are no fewer than 152 who have had the good fortune to be returned to the House of Commons without being opposed in the constituencies which they respectively represent, and the proportion in which they are distributed among parties is as follows:—Conservatives, 84; Unionist Liberals, 33; Gladstonian Liberals, 35. In 415 cases there were contests at the General Election, or at the bye-elections which have occurred during the two years which have elapsed since that period. In regard to these 415 seats we desire to show what proportion are held by either Ministerialists or Gladstonians by majorities ranging from under fifty to under 1200. This, we think, we can more clearly show by the following table:—

					Conservatives and Unionist Liberals.		Gladstonians
Majorities under	50	.	.	.	14 seats	...	7 seats
Majorities over	70	and under	100	.	8	"	7
"	"	100	"	"	200	18	"
"	"	200	"	"	300	21	"
"	"	300	"	"	400	18	"
"	"	400	"	"	500	19	"
"	"	500	"	"	600	20	"
"	"	600	"	"	700	13	"
"	"	700	"	"	800	21	"
"	"	800	"	"	900	11	"
"	"	900	"	"	1000	13	"
"	"	1000	"	"	1100	13	"
"	"	1100	"	"	1200	7	"
					196		111
					111		

As being also of some interest, another table is appended, showing the majorities by which the remainder of the contested seats were won. These majorities range from 1200 to over 4000. It will be

observed that only four constituencies in Great Britain returned their representatives by a majority exceeding the last-mentioned number :—

					Conservatives and Unionist Liberals.		Gladstonians.		
Majorities over 1200 and under 1300					10 seats	...	5 seats		
"	"	1300	"	1400	6	"	...	6	"
"	"	1400	"	1500	6	"	...	9	"
"	"	1500	"	2000	17	"	...	11	"
"	"	2000	"	3000	10	"	...	14	"
"	"	3000	"	4000	6	"	...	4	"
"	"	4000	"	5000	1	"	...	3	"
					56			52	

For the purposes of argument it may be assumed that, where the majority exceeds 1200, the probability of one party winning any considerable number of seats from the other is not very great, but where the majority is below that figure, it may not unreasonably be assumed, in view especially of the remarkable transference of votes at Spalding, Northwich, Edinburgh West, Southampton, Burnley, and Ayr Burghs, that the case is very different and that the task of converting the adverse majority into a minority is a task not only not hopeless, but indeed highly probable !

A glance at the first of the foregoing tables will show that there are 196 Ministerial seats which are held by majorities of less than 1200, while of Gladstonian seats similarly held there are 111, or a difference of 85.

Recent bye-elections lead irresistibly to the conclusion that the country is turning against the policy of Coercion which is being so vigorously enforced in Ireland by the present Government, and it is difficult to see from what quarter Ministers can look for an accession of strength at the next General Election, whereas it is easy to see whence the Gladstonian Liberals may at that election derive such a considerable accession as will lead to the removal from power of the Government of Coercion, and the substitution in its place of a Ministry prepared to undertake the task of removing—not aggravating—the existing, and indeed admitted, grievances of Ireland. But if this accession of strength is to be gained by the Gladstonian party, every seat that has ever been contested before must of course be once again challenged at the next General Election ; and especially must *every one* of the seats held by Ministerialists by a majority of under 1200 be contested, and vigorously contested, and then it will be seen where the votes necessary to give Mr. Gladstone a majority will come from !

“ But two can play at that game ! ” it will be urged. Undoubtedly ; therefore, it is fair to assume that the Tories and their Unionist Liberal allies will attack every Gladstonian seat that has ever been contested before. Let them do so, and the result will

probably be that the great majority of seats so attacked will return an answer the same, only recorded more emphatically, as that given in recent bye-elections.

At this point it may not be inappropriate to state shortly what have been the results of bye-elections during the last two years. Dismissing, as being of little interest, all bye-elections in which the candidate has been returned unopposed, we find that of contested elections there have been thirty-one in number. In twenty-one of these constituencies Ministerialists were returned at the General Election, while the remaining ten returned Gladstonians. The result of the bye-elections has been that the Ministerialists have won fifteen, and the Gladstonians sixteen out of the thirty-one, or a net gain to the latter of six seats. It may also be observed that the Gladstonians have improved their position, since the General Election, in no fewer than nineteen of these constituencies, as against a Ministerial improvement in but five cases; while in seven instances it is impossible to institute a comparison, owing to the candidates having been unopposed in 1886. The Gladstonians, while making a net gain of six seats, have actually wrested seven seats from their opponents, who, on the other hand, have been similarly successful in no more than one solitary instance.

It is a point of some significance that in all these seven seats gained by the Gladstonians, as also in the one seat gained by the Tories, a majority of less than 1200 was recorded for the successful candidate at the General Election!

It has been shown that the Gladstonians hold 111 seats by majorities of under 1200, the Ministerialists holding in like manner 196; put the 111 seats held by Gladstonians against 111 out of the 196 held by Ministerialists, and there remains a balance of 85 Conservative and Unionist Liberal seats for the Gladstonians to endeavour to win. In addition, there are thirty-three Liberal Unionist seats which were not contested at the last General Election, and of this number it is now plain that at least one-half ought to have been contested, and were only left unmolested through a sentimental feeling that Liberals ought not to oppose Liberals. That feeling has, however, died away, and it seems certain that no Unionist Liberal seat will in the future be left unassailed. It is true that in thirty-five cases the Gladstonian Liberals were allowed a walk over, and perhaps wisely so; for the chance of a Tory or Unionist Liberal candidate winning any of these seats was of the remotest type *then*, and is not likely to be any better *now*!

In no fewer than eighty-four instances Conservative candidates were returned unopposed. Why should this have been so, and is it to happen again? In 1874, too many Conservative seats were unchallenged, and the result of the 1880 election showed this to have

been a tremendous mistake ; for at that election many of the so-called Tory strongholds collapsed like a house of cards, when exposed to really serious attack.

Taking into consideration all bye-elections since the General Election of 1886, the composition of the House of Commons at the present time is as follows :—Conservatives, 312 ; Liberal Unionists, 71 ; Gladstonian Liberals, 202 ; Parnellites, 85. Total, 670. We include as Gladstonians, though they have not undergone the process of re-election consequent on the change in their political opinions, Sir Thomas Grove, Mr. C. R. Talbot, Mr. Benjamin Hingley, Sir Hussey Vivian, and Mr. A. B. Winterbotham, all of whom, elected in 1886 as Unionist Liberals, have since seen fit to return to the ranks serving under the leadership of Mr. Gladstone.

It is thus shown that at the present time the united forces of the Tories and Liberal Unionists number 383, while the combined Gladstonian Liberal and Parnellite strength is 287, or a majority for the Ministerialists of 96.

This is no doubt a large majority, but the question arises, Is it likely to be an enduring majority ? The experience of the past is to some extent an answer to this question, inasmuch as in two years' time the Government majority has been reduced from 118 to 96, and it would further seem that this majority can hardly be an enduring one, for the very simple reason that the party possessing it holds no fewer than 196 seats by majorities ranging from under 50 to under 1200 ; and it is in seats of this very description that it has lost most ground at bye-elections.

We have already said that, after the Ayr Burghs elections, it cannot be out of place to assume that no seat can be considered as safe which shows a majority of less than 1200 for the successful candidate. Admitting this fact, it will at once be seen that Ministerialists hold 196 unsafe seats as against 111 unsafe Opposition seats ; thus, the Ministerialists hold 85 more unsafe seats than do the Gladstonians. This balance of 85 seats ought all to be won by the Gladstonians at next General Election, and, reasoning from past experience, it seems extremely probable that they *will* be won ; moreover, not less than ten or a dozen of the 33 previously uncontested Unionist Liberal seats ought to be gained. If this be done, victory is accomplished, and the day of Coercion is for ever dead. But some one is sure to say : " Why, you don't seem to count on the Tories or Unionist Liberals winning any seats from the Gladstonian Liberals."

At first sight this may appear to be so, but in reality it is not the case, and this we shall proceed to show, only, before doing so, we will candidly and frankly admit that we do not expect to see the Unionist Liberals gain from their opponents even a single seat

wherewith to console themselves for the large number which it seems tolerably certain they will lose.

For an Opposition to lose absolutely none of their seats at a general election is a thing unheard of, and it may therefore be calculated that the Tories will wrest from their opponents, say, thirty or forty seats. But we anticipate that the Gladstonian Liberals will win from the Ministerialists not less than from 110 to 120 seats, and will thus make a net gain of between eighty and ninety votes, each side winning seats from the other mainly in constituencies where the previous majority was no greater than 1200, or perhaps even to some extent in constituencies where the majority was as high as 1500!

And this we take to be a not over-exaggerated estimate of the measure of Gladstonian success, because 120 seats bear very much the same proportion to 40 seats as does 3 to 1, whereas the bye-elections which have occurred since the General Election of 1886 show a gain to the Opposition of 7 seats and to the Ministerialists of 1 seat, or in the proportion of *seven* to one!

Between 7 to 1 and 3 to 1 there is a not inconsiderable margin, and it is partly on this fact that we base our assertion that we are not over-sanguine in estimating the net Gladstonian gain at from 80 to 90 seats. In further support of this contention, we turn to the results of all bye-elections wherein there has been a contest since last General Election, and wherein, at that election, the majority did not exceed 1200. We find that the Ministerialists have attacked six Gladstonian seats answering to this description, and have succeeded in winning only *one*, while, on the other hand, the Gladstonians have assailed twelve Ministerial seats of the same description, and have gained no less than *seven*. In other words, all seats gained by either side have been gained in constituencies where the previous majority was under 1200!

It has before been stated that there are 196 Ministerial and 111 Gladstonian seats held by majorities of under 1200. A simple application of the rule of three shows that as 6 is to 1 so is 111 to 19, and as 12 is to 7 so is 196 to 114. Deduct 19 from 114, and 95 remains as the number of seats which, reasoning from the results of these bye-elections, Gladstonians may expect to win at the General Election, in constituencies of the class before mentioned, thus proving that, as previously asserted, the Opposition may not improbably make a net gain of at least between 80 and 90 seats in constituencies with a former adverse majority of under 1200.

It may here be observed that, prior to the enlargement of the county constituencies, and the disappearance of the very small boroughs, through the operation of the Franchise and Redistribution Acts, majorities of under 1200 were in most cases as difficult to break down and convert into a minority as majorities of 3000 or 4000

are difficult to break down at the present time. In corroboration of this statement, we cite (as being fairly representative of the old borough constituencies) the case of Bridgnorth, which, possessing a total electorate of 1224, returned a Conservative by a majority of 327 at the General Election of 1880. Now, in regard to such a constituency, Liberals might not unnaturally feel that there was little or no chance of breaking down a majority which in itself included a little over 25 per cent. of the total electors, just as at the present time they might feel sceptical as to the possibility of breaking down an adverse majority of 2500 in a constituency possessing 10,000 electors. But now that these little constituencies are swept away, the case is very different so far as relates to majorities of about 1200, for you would say that such majorities bear very much the same proportion to the enlarged constituencies as did majorities of about 125 to the small constituencies which existed prior to the passing of the Acts of 1885.

And if this be said of majorities of about 1200, what can be said regarding majorities of 600 and under, except that they are so trifling as to be certainly wiped out by the very slightest change in the political leanings of the electors? This is a difference between the past order of things, as compared with the present, which it is important to note.

To return to the more immediate consideration of the prospects of the Gladstonian party, it will be remembered that we claimed for that party a probable gain of from 80 to 90 seats in constituencies where the majority was no greater than 1200. We further asserted that from ten to a dozen seats would most likely be won from the Unionist Liberals in the 33 seats wherein no contest took place in 1886. It may, however, be urged that this is an assumption, and nothing more than an assumption, and in deference to such an objection we will not, in the calculation which we are about to make, give to the Gladstonian party the credit of winning any of these 33 hitherto uncontested Liberal Unionist seats. It will, then, be observed that we assume, though this is in all probability a somewhat unlikely assumption, that not one of the 33 hitherto unopposed Liberal Unionist seats, and not one of the 84 hitherto uncontested Tory seats, will be won at the coming election. These 117 Ministerial seats may be taken as a set off to the 35 unopposed Gladstonian seats, but whether this is altogether a fair set off it will be for the electors in those constituencies to decide when the proper time comes. What, then, would be the composition of the entire House of Commons if the Gladstonians made a net gain of 80 seats at next General Election? We should have parties in the following proportions:—Conservatives and Liberal Unionists, 303; Gladstonian Liberals and Nationalists, 367; or a majority for the latter of 64.

The next question that arises is—Will this be done? The results of nearly all the contested bye-elections show that the Liberal vote is once again pretty much what it was in 1885, before that party was rent with discussions on the question of granting Home Rule to Ireland, thus proving that Liberal electors throughout the country are again united against their traditional opponents, the Tories. The result of the Isle of Thanet election brought out this fact very clearly, and when it is remembered that that constituency is situated in the county of Kent—a county always conspicuous for its adherence to Toryism—it seems all the more remarkable that the Liberals should actually have decreased, not only the adverse majority of 1886, but also the adverse majority of 1885! If this has happened in a Kentish constituency, what may not the constituencies in Lancashire and Yorkshire, and indeed throughout the rest of Great Britain, be expected to do when an opportunity is given them? Let but the Liberals vote as they voted in 1885, and they will now have the support of the Irish vote, which they had not in that year; let them contest with a dogged determination every seat that has ever before been contested, and allow not one single Liberal Unionist, and only a very few Tories, to be returned to Westminster unopposed, and then it will be that the Liberal victory of 1885 will be equalled, if not surpassed, and the Tory majority of 96, representing as it does the policy of tyranny and Coercion, will be swept ignominiously from power, making way in its fall for a majority representative of a policy no less the antithesis of Coercion, than the embodiment of justice and conciliation to the sister country of Ireland.

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE CONCERNING MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

IN the "Independent Section" of this REVIEW, two ladies have recently discussed the subject of marriage from what they believe, we presume, to be the common-sense point of view. Mrs. Caird's conclusion is "that the present form of marriage—exactly in proportion to its conformity with orthodox ideas—is a vexatious failure"; and that "the ideal marriage, despite all dangers and difficulties, should be free. So long as love and trust and friendship remain, no bonds are necessary to bind two people together; life apart will be empty and colourless; but whenever these cease, the tie becomes false and iniquitous, and no one ought to have the power to enforce it. The matter is one in which any interposition, whether of law or of society, is an impertinence." Miss Elizabeth Rachel Chapman, on the other hand, expresses her conviction thus: "Is it not Tolstoi who, in his re-statement of the 'second commandment' of Jesus, has uttered the watchword of the future? 'Let every man have one wife, and every woman one husband. No libertinage and no divorce.'" The expediency of polygamy is not discussed by either of these writers; and in the numerous letters published in the *Daily Telegraph*, to which Mrs. Caird's article has given rise, letters purporting to discuss the question, Is marriage a failure? the form of marriage referred to is exclusively that of monogamy. But, since those articles were published, we have received a work, entitled *Marriage and Divorce*, in which its author maintains that "almost the whole of Christendom has gone astray from the plain teaching of the Scriptures on the subject of marriage;" and in which he insists that polygamy is the form of marriage not only authorized, but distinctly sanctioned by the "Almighty," that the practice of divorce is equally a divine ordination, and that both polygamy and divorce, far from being forbidden, are actually countenanced in the New Testament.

The work in question is anonymous and presents no clue to its authorship; but, from internal evidence, we are disposed to conclude that its author is a priest of one of the numerous sections into which English Christians are divided; he is, certainly, thoroughly well acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and has formed very decided opinions as to the import of their teaching concerning the grave and

momentous questions he discusses. He appears to be a devout believer in the divine inspiration of those writings, and to regard them as the revelation of truth and the trustworthy means of human guidance. In his opening chapter, he says:—

“ If it can be shown that any of the laws, customs, or prejudices of the present day are not really founded upon Truth, or not strictly consistent with Justice, then we claim that this matter should be fairly and honestly considered, and that any alteration or reformation which may be clearly required by these great principles should be adopted without hesitation, and with as little delay as possible. We claim this from all those persons who as legislators or politicians take any part in the direction of public affairs; but most of all we claim it from all those who assume to speak as ministers of religion, especially ministers of the Christian religion. For this, at least, is a prominent and unquestionable feature of Christianity, that it professes to be based upon *Truth*; to be a message from the God of Truth; it repudiates all falsehood, and desires not to be propped up by anything in the shape of a lie; nor can any man be a faithful exponent of this religion who places any consideration of expediency or self-interest above the paramount claims of Truth.”

The contrast of “ expediency ” with “ Truth ” in the above passage will, we dare say, produce a telling effect on many of our author's readers; but, unfortunately, in the following passage, as well as in many others throughout the book, he proves faithless to the standard of Truth, which he professes to follow. He says: “ It is well understood that many of the laws and ordinances prescribed for the Jews in the earlier periods of sacred history were never intended to be binding on the whole race of mankind, nor even, as to some of them, upon the Jews themselves in perpetuity. And many of these institutions are either directly or indirectly set aside by the principles of Christianity, and their observance is declared to be no longer required, at any rate as a matter of duty, by Christians. But although this is undoubtedly true of many parts of the Mosaic law, it does not hold good with all the precepts of that Code.”

Now, we should like to know what is the standard by which our author ascertains whether any given law or ordinance prescribed in the Old Testament is, or is not, “ binding on the whole race of mankind.” He tells us that some of the “ laws and ordinances ” in question concerned the Jews only, and that some contain the “ great and universal principles ” of a “ fundamental and permanent character.” How does he distinguish them and assign to each its peculiar value? In this matter the “ Sacred Writings ” themselves give him no help; they are absolutely silent on the important question—which of these laws and ordinances concern the Jews only, and which are designed for the guidance of the whole human race; which are of merely local and temporary, and which are of universal and per-

manent, application? We venture to affirm that, so far as the Christian world has made any progress in answering these questions, it has been guided by the much condemned principle of "expediency;" and, certainly, our author, notwithstanding that he ranks it much lower than "Truth," does not hesitate to avail himself of it whenever he encounters a moral or social problem which he finds it difficult to solve. He does not tell us how he has arrived at the conclusion that God's dealings with his favourite servants, Abraham, Jacob, Elkanah, and King David, in respect to their practice of polygamy are to be accepted in evidence of the divine approval of that practice as a more or less universal practice of mankind in general. In fact, our author's statements in this matter are, as it seems to us, merely indications that, guided by the principle of expediency, he has arrived at the conclusion that polygamy is a beneficent institution, conducive, under certain circumstances, to the welfare and happiness of mankind, and that as he finds, according to the Bible, this institution has the divine approval, he infers that this approval is to be regarded as an expression of the divine sanction of the practice of polygamy by all peoples and throughout all time. Be this as it may, it is evident that our author attaches supreme importance to God's dealings with the patriarchs in respect to polygamy.

Referring to "Abraham himself as the Head and Father of God's chosen people," our author says, "at the suggestion of Abraham's wife, Sarah, and during her own lifetime, he took to him as a secondary wife, or concubine, her maid-servant, Hagar, and by her he had a son born to him, whom he named Ishmael. He did this clearly, not under any temptation of lust, not with any idea that he was doing wrong, but with the express motive of obtaining issue by her, and accomplishing, as he thought, God's purposes and promises to him of a numerous offspring."

Our author appears to possess some special source of information respecting the state of Abraham's mind and the nature of his motives when he took Hagar as a "secondary wife;" for, certainly, the sacred history gives us no information on the point; we only learn from it, that, in a "vision" of a conversation with the Lord God, Abraham said: "Behold to me hast thou given no seed; and lo, one born in my house is my heir," and that the Lord said, "but he that shall come forth from thine own bowels shall be thine heir;" and that Abraham took Hagar as a "secondary wife" in compliance with the request of Sarah, who "said unto Abraham, behold now the Lord hath restrained me from bearing;" and besought him to accept her maid, adding: "It may be that I may obtain children by her." The question to what extent our author is correct in asserting that when Abraham acted on Sarah's suggestion he was not under any temptation of lust, and thought only of accomplishing God's purposes, is, perhaps, of little practical importance; nevertheless, we hesitate to

admit the trustworthiness of these statements, seeing that they are unsupported by scriptural evidence, and that, as we presume, our author is not a clairvoyant in respect to the motives which animated Abraham in connection with the interesting event referred to. Our author comments on that event as follows :—" Now if polygamy is in its very essence and principle simply a breach of God's fundamental law of marriage, then, of course, this act of Abraham was an error, more or less blamable according to the degree of knowledge which he had received of God's law. It might be that he sinned in ignorance, as Abimelech was about to do ; it might be that he sinned knowingly and wilfully, even as Adam did in Paradise ; for we are not to suppose that even Abraham was wholly without sin. On the former of these hypotheses, that he acted in ignorance of the divine law, can we believe that God, who so carefully interfered to prevent the crime of adultery on the part of Pharaoh, and again of Abimelech, would altogether neglect the same care in regard to his more favoured servant Abraham ; if, that is to say, the union with Hagar was really a sin of adultery in His sight ? The other hypothesis, that Abraham sinned wilfully herein, is still more incredible and inconsistent with the whole tenor of the sacred narrative. There is not a word to be found in the whole history—which relates so many occasions of God's special and personal communion with this great patriarch, there is not a single word in the whole Bible from beginning to end which implies that the Divine Being was in any way offended with Abraham's conduct on that occasion, or condemned it as a sin.

" But not only this, the whole story of Hagar is declared by St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, to contain a great allegory, a typical foreshadowing of God's dealings with mankind, first under the covenant of the Law, and next under the Gospel. This is certainly a most remarkable and important testimony ; it must be quite obvious, that if there is any truth or authority belonging to this assertion of St. Paul, that Abraham's conduct in this matter was a positive type of God's own doings, then there could not possibly be anything sinful therein ; then it is quite impossible for us, consistently with any regard for the authority of Scripture, to condemn polygamy, such as that of Abraham, as a matter of principle, as being absolutely and altogether opposed to the law of God."

Our author next adduces the history of that celebrated personage, Jacob, in order to show that though this eminent patriarch also practised polygamy to a greater extent even than Abraham, he " lived under the special guidance of Almighty God," and " received God's blessing on many very remarkable occasions." The interesting story of the domestic life of Jacob is known to every reader of the Bible ; he had two wives, Leah and Rachel, both of whom he loved, and who appear to have loved him. Leah gave him six sons and

one daughter, and two sons were born to him by the tender-eyed Rachel. But as a long time elapsed before she became a mother, and as she wished for children, she besought Jacob to accept her maid Bilhah, saying, "that I may also have children by her." Jacob complied, and had two sons by Rachel's handmaid. And although Leah had already given her husband four sons, she, anxious to enrich him still further, "took Zilpah, her maid, and gave her Jacob to wife;" and Zilpah enriched him with two additional sons. It is worthy of note that Leah, when she bore her fifth son, rejoiced in his coming as a reward for her generosity in giving her maid Zilpah to her husband: "God hath given me my hire, because I have given my maiden to my husband." Judged by nineteenth-century standards of morality, Jacob would be pronounced little better than an astute trickster: he managed, owing to his brother's hunger, to possess himself of his brother's birthright; executing the scheme devised by his mother, he succeeded, with the help of downright lies, in so deceiving his old and blind father as to make him believe him to be Esau, and therefore to bless him as if he had really been Isaac's first-born son: and, finally, in the matter of the sheep, goats, and cattle which, according to a special agreement, were to be divided between Laban and himself—an agreement the execution of which was *entrusted* to him—he so contrived that "the feebler were Laban's and the stronger Jacob's."

But, notwithstanding these questionable doings, he was enriched to the extent of twelve sons and one daughter; he "increased exceedingly [in wealth], and had much cattle, and maid-servants, and men-servants, and camels and asses." How greatly he was favoured was foretold to him in his dream, when the Lord appeared to him and said to him, "Thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Our author may well say that this possessor of two wives and two concubines "lived under the special guidance of Almighty God."

Elkanah, the father of Samuel, is another polygamist mentioned by our author, and whose possession of two wives "God tolerated or sanctioned." It is written that "this man went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of hosts in Shiloh." His wife, Penninah, had sons and daughters; but his wife Hannah was childless. She was eminently pious; "and she vowed a vow, and said, O Lord of hosts, if thou wilt indeed look on the affliction of thine handmaid, and remember me, and not forget thine handmaid, but will give unto thine handmaid a man child, then I will give him unto the Lord all the days of his life, and there shall no razor come upon his head. . . . And the Lord remembered her" and "she bare a son, and she called his name

Samuel." It is written: "And all Israel from Dan even to Beersheba knew that" he "was established to be a prophet of the Lord."

The genuine piety evinced by Elkanah and Hannah merited and received the emphatic approval of Eli the priest, who "blessed Elkanah and his wife. . . . And the Lord visited Hannah so that she conceived and bare three sons and two daughters. And the child Samuel grew before the Lord." It is expressly stated in the sacred text that in answer to Hannah's prayer for a son "the Lord remembered her;" and certainly it must be admitted that the whole story implies that Elkanah, as well as Hannah, enjoyed the divine favour. Accordingly, our author observes: "In this case, if there is any truth in the words of the history, there can be no doubt about the fact of God's sanction being given to the polygamy. Yet if there was no sin on the part of Elkanah in taking two wives at the same time, why should the same thing be counted sinful in any other man? What is the law, what is the principle, which is to determine the question?" The author strengthens his position here assumed by reference to the history of King David, a "man after God's own heart," whose notoriously extensive relations with womankind seems to have lessened in no degree the amount of divine favour which was bestowed upon him.

"We are told," says our author, that "during the seven years that David was reigning in Hebron, he had six sons born to him, each one by a different wife (2 Sam. iii. 2-5). At the end of that period he went up to Jerusalem, and was established as king over all Israel and Judah. 'And David went on and grew great, and the Lord God of hosts was with him. . . . And David took him more concubines and wives out of Jerusalem, after he was come from Hebron, and there were yet sons and daughters born to David' (2 Sam. v. 10-13). Not only is there no shadow of rebuke here in regard to his plurality of wives—wives and concubines too; but in the very midst of all this polygamy we are told, 'The Lord God of hosts was with him.'"

Our author is very wroth with the late Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, who, commenting on the passage—"And David took him more concubines out of Jerusalem," charged David with sin in having done so, and alleged that it was "forbidden by God's law." He observes, however, "that the stain and blemish of the type finished in a divine Antitype." The author observes "that these charges of sin, charges which imply wilful, persistent sin against such men as King David and the patriarch Jacob, are not only entirely unsupported, but are directly contradicted by the evidence and declarations of Scripture itself."

It is alleged that polygamy was allowed to the Jewish people through the whole period embraced in the inspired history. There

is no record of any general prohibition or rebuke of it. It is therefore argued that if the fundamental theory of the Bible—viz., that the Jewish nation was under the special and providential government of Almighty God—the practice of polygamy which was general and exemplified in the lives of the most eminent and so-called saintly persons of Jewish history, must not only have had the divine permission, but his sanction, and could not therefore have been continued against the will of the supreme ruler—could not in fact be of the nature of sin, and therefore, as a matter of principle, fundamentally wrong.

Having made good his position, that polygamy is divinely authorized, by reviewing the history of the Jewish people contained in the Old Testament, our author then turns to the New, and observes: "Many persons probably will be much surprised to hear that there is no passage in the New Testament which forbids the practice to Christians generally;" and we must admit that he fairly sustains his position. For his comments on and explanation of the passage in Matthew xix. 1-6, ending with the words, "What therefore God hath joined together let no man put asunder," we must refer our readers to the author's work, page 42.

"We are told," he says, "'Whosoever shall put away his wife except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.' Does not this positively forbid polygamy? Clearly not. What indeed can be plainer than the words themselves, 'Whosoever shall put away his wife . . . and marry another:' if therefore a man does not put away his wife, but marries another in addition, then this dictum of Christ does not apply to them at all."

Referring to the teachings of St. Paul, our author adverts to one of his expressions which, as he says, "has often been thought to be in direct opposition to polygamy." In answer to some questions which the Corinthians had submitted to him on the subject of marriage, Paul writes: "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband" (1 Cor. vii. 2). Our author comments on this passage thus: "The inference, however, which has been drawn from these words, however natural it may seem at first sight, is not truly in accordance with the Apostle's meaning. The primary object of his advice is, not that every man and woman should have one wife and one husband, and one only; but that every one, both man and woman, should live in the married state, not in the state of celibacy. This is clear enough, not only from the words that he uses, but from the reason that he gives—'in order to avoid fornication'—well knowing that with a large part of mankind the alternative is between conjugal intercourse in a lawful form or an unlawful form."

The passage which really does most directly touch this question of

polygamy, is the rule which this Apostle lays down concerning the bishops and deacons of the Church. "A bishop," he says, "must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, &c." (1 Tim. iii. 2-7; cf. Titus i. 6). Again, "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well." Our author remarks on these passages thus: "There are two interpretations which have been assigned to this phrase, 'the husband of one wife.' (1) A man who has not more than one wife at a time—i.e., who is not a polygamist; (2) a man who has not married a second time after the death of his first wife. If the former of these is the true meaning in this place, then the sentence shows very clearly that polygamy was not abolished in the Church generally at that time; for, if there were no polygamists among the Christian brotherhood, it would be superfluous to name this as one of the conditions required in the bishop; just as much so as it would be in the English Church at the present day. At the same time, supposing this to be the true meaning, the phrase cannot be taken as a prohibition of polygamy universally: it is a limitation applied strictly to the bishops, or elders, and the deacons. . . . If the other meaning of the phrase is to be accepted, then it imposes an additional restriction upon the ministers of the Church in regard to their marriage; but leaves untouched the question of polygamy among the laity generally."

Although our author has fairly succeeded in demonstrating that, as "a matter of principle," polygamy is not condemned or prohibited either in the Old Testament or the New; that under the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations it was generally and continuously practised, and under such conditions as to imply the full sanction of Almighty God; yet as a matter of expediency he seems inclined to admit that monogamy as a general rule is more conducive than is polygamy to domestic peace and happiness; more consistent with the principles of temperance, manliness, and other personal virtues which men ought to aim at, and especially more consonant with that deep feeling of love and union which belongs to the Christian ideal of marriage. It seems therefore that considerations of expediency actually lead our author to condemn polygamy as a general practice, although, according to him, divine truth and the principle it reveals are in favour of polygamy. Indeed, our author's attempt in the beginning of his work to contrast divine truth and expediency fairly breaks down when he comes to deal with the actual life of the present time. Then common sense is allowed to become ascendant, and the virtue derived from a belief in the supernatural origin of the Hebrew Scriptures loses its force. The value of the scriptural argument and the influence which it will exert will depend wholly upon the state of mind of his different readers. Those who have been accustomed to receive all that is said in the Old and New Testaments as of divine authority will probably experience grave embarrassment in

presence of our author's arguments; for, on the one hand, their respect for the sacred text will constrain them to admit that many of the great personages whose lives are recorded in the Bible and who are alleged to have been special objects of divine favour, practised polygamy, and, in many cases, on an astonishingly great scale; on the other hand, their instincts, the outcome of many monogamous generations, will constrain them to recoil with horror from the contemplation of the practice of polygamy by European people. One result of this embarrassment will, in all probability, be a further loosening of the conviction which in many minds has already been considerably shaken, that the manners and customs exemplified by the Jews, and which have been long believed to have been ordained by God himself, are binding on the people of modern Europe. Indeed, this breaking down of the conviction just mentioned has been steadily going on during several centuries, and has come to be represented by the idea that the manners and customs in question formed part of an old dispensation now no longer in force, and that the teachings of the New Testament alone constitute the essential guides to Christian life. Another important result of our author's work will consist, we think, in the development of a larger and more catholic spirit in respect to the institutions essentially alien to our own. As he justly remarks:—

“ In looking at this question of polygamy, we must not confine our view to the condition of English society, nor even to social conditions and sentiments of Christian nations generally. The subject is really one of universal, world-wide importance; it must be looked at in reference to the whole human race. And, in the present day, when our own intercourse with the whole world is so rapidly increasing, with the many millions of those who yet stand outside the pale of the Christian Church, but whom we are so anxious to bring within its influence; having regard to this great fact, we say that it is most especially necessary that we should be able to rise above the narrow prejudices by which we are here surrounded, that we should deal with it on none other than the sure and solid ground of truth. If, indeed, the system of polygamy is absolutely, positively, and unquestionably forbidden by the law of Christ, then certainly our sacred duty to our Divine Master requires us to proclaim this fact, with all forbearance and all charity, but yet with all firmness, and faithfulness to the Church, and to the world; and not to admit any persons to the special privileges of the Church, unless they conform to this law. But, on the other hand, if, as we confidently affirm, this absolute and unquestionable law does not really exist; if it cannot be established on the authority of our received Scriptures—the only ultimate authority to which we can appeal—then certainly we have no right to force our own traditions and prejudices on other nations, other races of men, whose habits and characters, whose moral and physical condition and requirements, are so

very different from our own. We may say all that we think just and necessary in the way of persuasion, to show them what we deem the greater advantages of monogamy; but, at any rate, we have no right to insist upon this law, as a matter of religious obligation, where we cannot show the very clearest authority for doing so.

“And, again; before we presume to urge upon these other nations the necessity or even the advantages of monogamy, there is this further very serious question to be answered: Do we really practise anything like strict monogamy among ourselves? How much polygamy really prevails among all classes of society—and polygamy in its worst form, in the form of loose, illicit, clandestine intercourse? These are questions which have a very practical bearing upon this matter of preaching monogamy to the rest of the world. It is a fact which is generally admitted that in countries where polygamy is allowed, prostitution is almost unknown or is very rare; and there can be no doubt which of these two things is the most offensive in the sight of God, which is the most mischievous in its practical effects, both moral and physical.

“Assuredly, we have a good deal to do in the way of setting our own house in order, in casting the beam out of our own eyes, before we can assume to correct all the rest of the world in this matter, to pull out the mote from our brother’s eye.”

When entering on the “critical question of divorce and separation,” our author says that it is to be determined as a *matter of principle*—by which we understand him to mean the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures—and adds: “The first question is whether Marriage is altogether incapable of being dissolved by anything short of death?” The story of making Eve out of one of Adam’s ribs, together with his exclamation, when “the Lord God brought her unto” him, “This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh,” which is relied upon as proof that marriage is indissoluble, is adverted to by our author, who endeavours to show that it has no force as against the practice of separation or divorce. We are not strongly impressed with his observations concerning Adam’s declaration when Eve was presented to him; and, contenting ourselves by referring our readers to them (on pp. 53–4), we venture to add a few words respecting the story itself.

How did Adam learn that Eve was bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh? He was in a deep sleep while the surgical operation of extracting the rib and closing up “the flesh instead thereof” was performed. Indeed, it appears from the record as if Adam were wholly unconscious of the creation of Eve, and wholly ignorant of the source from which she was produced. How he came to know that she was bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh we are not told; and we find it difficult to conjecture how he got the information. However, having acquired it, he might have been justified in pro-

nouncing himself and his wife as "one flesh," and in declaring that, therefore, they should cleave to each other. But, as he had neither father nor mother, and as no such beings as human parents then existed, and, indeed, as no man except Adam and no woman except Eve was then on the earth, we find it difficult to understand how he came to utter the sentence, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh."

Of course, if Adam knew that one of his ribs had been transformed into a woman, he was justified in declaring the woman "bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh;" but as there is reason to believe that no woman except Eve has been produced from a man's rib, no man, except Adam, is justified in declaring any woman "bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh." Hence, as any such declaration would have no foundation in fact, the argument for the indissolubility of marriage, based on the assertion that a man's wife is "bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh," is wholly untenable.

Our author supports his case in favour of divorce by citing certain well-known precedents in favour of divorce—the first being that of Abraham's "secondary wife," Hagar. Our author states that, "although Hagar is sometimes called the concubine of Abraham, yet she was a wife in all essential particulars. The concubines of Scripture were, in fact, true and lawful wives, though generally holding a lower rank in the household, and not unfrequently being bondwomen, as was Hagar." Of course, the more indisputable the validity of her marriage the more authoritative as a precedent was her divorce, which, as we are assured by our author, "took place under Almighty God—even against Abraham's own personal inclinations, and his sense of justice and duty to his bondwoman."

The well-known facts of this case are as follows:—Abraham's wife Sarah, being childless, besought Abraham to accept her maid Hagar, saying, "It may be that I may obtain children by her. And Abraham hearkened to the voice of Sarah," who gave him Hagar "*to be his wife*. . . . When she saw that she had conceived, her mistress was despised in her eyes." This was more than Sarah could bear; and, accordingly, she "dealt hardly" with Hagar, who "fled from her face." Hagar was found "in the wilderness" by "the angel of the Lord," who "said unto her, Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself under her hands." Hagar returned; and during her stay at the patriarchal home the miracle of Sarah's maternity occurred. Her child, Isaac, "grew, and was weaned. . . . And Sarah saw the son of Hagar, the Egyptian, which she had borne unto Abraham, mocking. Wherefore she said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son; for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son" [Ishmael]. But God told him to hearken to Sarah's voice; and, accordingly,

"Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away; and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba. And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bowshot; for she said, Let me not see the death of the child. And she sat over against him and lifted up her voice and wept."

Commenting on this interesting record, our author says: "Looking at the example before us, and admitting, as it is only reasonable to do, that there is a certain general law which binds man and wife together, yet we say it clearly cannot have that strict and inviolable character which some persons would claim for it; it cannot be absolutely essential to marriage, otherwise the Almighty would not be himself the first to break it, as the Bible here represents Him to be."

Assuming the function of God's advocate and defender, our author fills three printed pages in explaining and justifying God's command to Abraham to send Hagar away in the manner above mentioned, and we cannot help thinking that, while discharging his self-imposed task, he must have felt his sense of justice greatly strained. His defence seems to us especially ineffective and feeble; in concluding it, he says: "Another point of much practical importance here stated is that, when Abraham rose up in the morning to fulfil the divine command, he took bread and a bottle of water, and gave her what appeared sufficient for her immediate necessities; and, for the rest, there was God's own promise of protection, to which he confided her. *This, of course, was only just and reasonable.*"¹

Now let us suppose that the facts of this case were at the present day submitted for the first time to any Englishman of average intelligence and education, and fairly free from religious superstition—what would his judgment concerning it be likely to be? He would have to be informed that it was in compliance with the urgent solicitude of Sarah that Abraham took Hagar as a "secondary wife;" that Sarah's only complaint against Hagar was that, having conceived, she prided herself on her increased importance and made Sarah feel herself despised; that Ishmael mocked her; and, most important of all, that the idea of Ishmael becoming joint heir with Isaac to Abraham's possessions was utterly repugnant to her. On these grounds—and on these only—she insisted that Abraham should cast out Hagar and Ishmael from their home. Abraham thereupon drove Hagar and her son away, and sent them, homeless, into the desert, provided only with a piece of bread and a bottle of water.

Of course reasons like to those which moved Abraham to put Hagar away would avail absolutely nothing in an English court of law as grounds for a divorce; but an English court of law is very far from being a court of ideal justice; and for the very good

¹ The italics are ours.

reason that it is the interpreter and administrator of laws which, themselves, are anything but ideal; therefore we prefer to ask, What would be likely to be the judgment on the question of any sane Englishman of average intelligence and education, and fairly free from religious superstition? We believe he would denounce the conduct of Abraham as an exhibition of weak, unmanly subserviency to Sarah, and of mean and contemptible cruelty to Hagar and her son—cruelty which would not have been justified had their attitude towards Sarah been ten times more offensive than it actually was.

The fact that at this day—A.D. 1888—in the centre of European civilization, a man of no mean literary attainments and mental ability should come forward and gravely propose that Abraham's conduct in the matter in question shall form one of the precedents according to which the sexual relations of men and women shall now and henceforth be regulated, is to us simply an astounding marvel.

If, as the Bible affirms, God counselled Abraham to give heed to all that Sarah had said to him and to do her bidding, the history of Abraham's treatment of Hagar, under God's direction, is, nevertheless, scarcely likely to be accepted, even by devout believers in the divine authority of the Hebrew Scriptures, otherwise than as a record of God's dealing with a people whose moral nature had scarcely begun to dawn; but to suppose it capable of influencing modern thought and of moulding modern life is to indulge in one of those delusions chiefly found in lunatic asylums.

In the twenty-first chapter of Exodus directions are given concerning domestic slaves. Two of them are as follows:—"If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve; and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. . . . If his mother have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons and daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself." The interference here authorized by "Holy Writ" with the conjugal life of slaves by their master is adduced by our author as being "in direct opposition to that theory which supposes the bond of marriage to be indissoluble, or to be lawfully dissolved only in the event of the wife's adultery. . . . It is quite impossible to believe that God could ever have been the Author of such a law as this, even for a temporary purpose, even for the Jews alone, if that theory were an essential principle of marriage in his sight. . . . We are compelled by the force of truth to say that this enactment does appear harsh and tyrannical, and not consistent with our ideas of a legislation derived directly from the great Creator." But, adds our author, "single passages like these . . . are not sufficient to overpower the great weight of internal evidence in favour of the divine character of the Bible." Therefore, it was a divine ordinance which authorized a Jewish slave-owner to separate husbands and wives for life; and, therefore, this ordinance is adduced as an additional reason that, according to the divine will, marriage is dissoluble on various grounds

—in this instance, because if it were not the slave-owner would suffer loss ! Other passages are cited from the Book of Deuteronomy by our author to enforce his thesis ; for example, if a beautiful woman be taken captive in war, and if her captor has “ a desire unto her,” he may take her to his house, and after she has observed certain formalities, including mourning for her parents a full month, he may become her husband ; but if he have no delight in her, he is authorized to “ let her go whither she will.” Our author asks, “ What judgment are we to pronounce on such a permission as this ? ” And he replies, “ We must either give up the Book of Deuteronomy altogether, at least as a book of divine authority, and with it we must give up the Book of Exodus and the Book of Genesis, too ; or else we must give up the theory of the indissolubility of marriage as being a part of God’s law.”

Our author would, we suppose, be very sorry to give up the Book of Deuteronomy, for its twenty-first chapter contains the most direct and explicit ordinance authorizing divorce contained in the Bible. It is as follows : “ When a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes ; . . . then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man’s wife.” This ordinance proves, as it seems to us, that a Jewish husband could divorce his wife for any slight cause, or, indeed, without any cause at all ; and, as our author observes, “ the cause of offence, whatever it might be, could not be anything amounting to actual adultery, as that crime is already disposed of, and condemned with the penalty of death ”—also, by the authority of a divine enactment, never, so far as we are aware, formally cancelled.

The return of the Jews from captivity took place in several detachments, chiefly between 536 and 457 B.C. A large number returned under Ezra at the latter date. “ It was at this time, very soon after their arrival in Jerusalem, that it was reported to Ezra that many of the Jews, either of those who had lately returned, or more probably some who had returned previously—had made marriages with the ‘ people of the lands ; ’ that is to say, with the Canaanites, Hittites, and other idolatrous tribes who had never been thoroughly extirpated from the country : ” so that, as it is written in the Book of Ezra, “ the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of those lands : yea, the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass,” which “ was in direct violation of God’s express commandments, repeated on several occasions in the Mosaic law.” Under the influence of Ezra, who was “ a ready scribe in the law of Moses,” there “ assembled unto him out of Israel a very great congregation of men, women, and children,” and at this meeting it was resolved that those who had married strange women should put away their wives, “ and such as are born of them. . . . And Ezra

made the chief priests, the Levites, and all Israel, to swear to do according to this word. And they swear." A systematic inquisition was made into all the cases of such sinful marriages by a commission of four, and a general divorce of the strange wives was effected, says our author, "as one of the most important things in the way of reformation, and reconciling the people to their God. And altogether it would seem that this proceeding was effected under divine guidance and inspiration, as much as the work of any other prophet recorded in Scripture."

Our author asks how far the reason for which these marriages were dissolved "may have any practical application for ourselves. . . . There are still unbelievers and even idolaters of various kinds, unhappily too numerous in the world, even in this age of knowledge, civilization, and Christianity. And inasmuch as our intercourse with all parts of the world has been so greatly developed, especially during the present century and this generation, probably the instances in which marriages are contracted between Christians and these unbelievers are not at all infrequent; and therefore it becomes by no means an idle question to ask---What should a Christian do in such a case? If he finds that, either through ignorance, carelessness, or even wilfulness, he has made a mistake herein, and that his own religious principles, his peace, or the welfare of his children are being seriously endangered, does this example of Ezra give him any guidance in such a real, practical difficulty? Ought he to tolerate in his own house, and with his own direct sanction, any proceedings, any principles, or any teaching which are clearly dishonouring to the God of heaven, or positively opposed to his own religious convictions?

"And it is not only with regard to professed idolaters or unbelievers that this question applies; but when we consider how many persons there are nowadays who are indeed Christians in name and profession, baptized members of the Christian Church, but who have really little or no Christian faith in their hearts; . . . we must see that the practical application of this question, or of the principle involved in it, is very wide indeed."

The passage above referred to in the Book of Ezra "clearly shows a fresh reason for separation;" it also shows that, in the case in question, though there was nothing to vitiate the marriages in principle, it was judged expedient that they should be dissolved; and further, as our author tells us, that this judgment was "*enforced by the direct command or authority of Almighty God.*"

Now, if our bishops, the highly paid official interpreters of the Bible which they declare to be God's Word, will only induce her Christian Majesty's Ministers to bring in a Bill, and, by the help of their potent majority, to pass it into law, providing that God's precedent recorded in the Book of Ezra shall be followed, and, accordingly, that every man who finds himself yoked with an unbeliever or idolater, every man who "through ignorance, carelessness, or even wilfulness,

has made a mistake," and has married the woman he ought not to have done, "so that his own religious principles, his peace, or the welfare of his children are being seriously endangered," may forthwith dissolve his marriage and be at liberty to marry again, *half* the difficulty which is troubling the spirit of Mrs. Caird would be removed; and there would only remain for her and her sympathizing sisterhood the task of promoting and effecting the passage of a Bill on behalf of her own sex, of a nature corresponding to that of the Bill just mentioned. When that task shall have been accomplished, men and women will live on equal terms, marriage and divorce will be matters of purely personal concern; and indeed the kingdom of heaven, in which, as Christ announced, there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage, will probably be very near its realization on earth.

We have left ourselves but little space in which to advert to our author's remarks on the teachings of the New Testament in respect to divorce. The most striking passages, and which, no doubt, have exerted the greatest amount of influence in forming Christian opinion on these important subjects, and thus in moulding Christian life, are as follows: "Have ye not read, that He which made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." And again, in the 9th verse of the same chapter, it is said: "Whosoever shall put away his wife except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery" (Matt. xix. 4, 6, 9). We agree with our author in the opinion that the reasons given in the first of these passages are decidedly vague, "that there is, as St. Paul declares, a certain mystery contained in these words, and that it is, perhaps, not easy to define their meaning very precisely;" and that, in fact, it is difficult to see how they really have any practical bearing on the subject in question. The second passage appears at first sight to have much more force as a condemnation of divorce. But our author makes what may, perhaps, be held to be a remark of considerable weight. He says: "If a man *does not* put away his wife but marries another in addition, then, so far as these particular words go, he is certainly not convicted of adultery."

This argument seems to us more skilful than sound; and, notwithstanding our author's explanations, we are constrained to believe that the generally accepted meaning of Christ's emphatic words on this matter is the correct one. Paul's view of the subject appears to differ considerably from that of Christ. In dealing with the question of the marriage of believers with unbelievers, and the difficulties which may arise between them in consequence of their difference of faith, he says: "Unto the married I command, yet not

I but the Lord, let not the wife depart from the husband: but if she depart let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife. . . . But for the rest speak I, not the Lord. If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away: and the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. . . . But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. *A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases.*"¹

It is clear from the above that a very large discretion in the matter of separation and divorce was accorded by Paul to the Christian disciples; and, inasmuch as the most civilized part of the world is professedly Christian, Paul's ordinations in this matter may be fairly considered as generally applicable. With reference to the emphatic denunciation of divorce by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount, our author makes the following judicious remarks:—"Jesus Christ was not here giving absolute laws either to the Jewish nation or to his own disciples; He was not exercising power as an earthly sovereign, promulgating a code of laws which was to be enforced upon mankind by any external authority: but his precepts and his principles were addressed to his hearers and followers personally, addressed to their consciences, to their hearts: they were spoken in the way of exhortation and persuasion, warning and encouragement. They therefore set up a high standard of morality and purity, faith and obedience; higher than anything that was strictly commanded by the letter of the law; yet not on that account contradicting the law itself, in its spirit: a high standard which we may all aim at for ourselves, though we may not attempt to enforce it, as a positive law, with its penalties attached, upon others."

There are numerous subordinate questions connected with the relation of the sexes discussed by our author. These we do not intend to deal with. We have purposely restricted ourselves to a review of the ordinances and doctrines respecting marriage and divorce which are contained in the Old and in the New Testament, and which our author has presented in a convenient form for the apprehension and consideration of his readers. It is clear from the brief review given in the preceding pages that there are three fairly distinct phases of thought, and consequently of practice, exhibited in the sacred books in respect both to marriage and divorce. In the primitive state of society represented by the patriarchs the status of woman was especially low, and the treatment of her was correspondingly unjust. As among Oriental nations generally which still manifest in large measure the conditions presented by the Jewish people during the early period of their history, as given in the Old Testament, the will of man was supreme, that of woman but of small account; and that form of polygamy which especially recognizes

¹ The italics are ours.

practically the subserviency, and, indeed, more or less the slavery, of woman prevailed, and divorce was freely practised by men according to their good pleasure, the claim of the woman to adequate provision in the event of being sent away not being recognized. A large measure of progress is exhibited in the society to which Paul's admonitions and directions related, for, though he undoubtedly not merely recognized the existence of polygamy and the facility of divorce, the general tenor of his teaching was in the direction of monogamy, and of indissoluble marriage as the ideal condition of humanity. But the highest conception of conjugal life which is put forward in the sacred writings is undoubtedly that expressed by Christ in his Sermon on the Mount—a conception which, we thoroughly agree with our author, needs to be understood in the sense he has described.

It seems to us that it behoves the Christian world to recognize and ponder well the different aspects of this question, as presented in the sacred writings, and to reflect on the fact that there are in one and the same book widely different teachings on this matter, and therefore that it is human reason alone, guided by experience, which must ultimately determine what form of conjugal relation and what amount of liberty of divorce shall usually obtain with the general consensus of civilized society.

Our author's work consists of thirteen chapters, to which is appended an instructive and able paper, entitled: "The Laws of England and Scotland as regards Marriage and Divorce, their Assimilation and Reform," by Mr. J. R. Davidson. Eleven of these chapters discuss the questions of marriage and divorce "by the light which the Scriptures throw upon" them. The twelfth and thirteenth discuss the same questions as questions of "moral and social expediency;" and, notwithstanding that the writer denounces the movement of the present day "to put the wife on a level with the husband" as "against Nature, against universal history, against the true well-being and happiness of married life;" we must signalize these chapters as a decidedly valuable contribution towards the elucidation of the subject which they treat. Indeed, we believe the work as a whole will prove of great service to the cause on behalf of which it was written. It is a compendious and accurate summary of scriptural precedents in respect both to marriage and divorce; it is calm and moderate in tone, eminently respectful to all forms of religious and social prejudice; and, throughout the author's treatment of his important subject, while loyal to the Scriptural doctrines he has expounded, he is thoroughly tolerant and practical, and advocates a reform likely, in our opinion, to conduce largely to the well-being and happiness of mankind.

CAUSES OF POPULAR SYMPATHY FOR IRELAND.

Is there popular sympathy for Ireland? If so, that is a new thing. During the seven centuries of the connection of that unfortunate country with England sympathy has never existed among electors. At the end of the last century there was, among extreme Radicals, as much sympathy for Emmet and Tone as there was among the Fox Whigs for Washington and Franklin. A generation later there was popular sympathy for O'Connell and Sheil, but it was more for their brilliant platform aid of English Reform, than from sympathy for the Irish question they represented. Catholic emancipation was not popular among the working-class. In Birmingham, petitions against it were freely signed. Under religious influence the number of signatures was increased. The terror of Rome played the same part then as the terror of separation does now. Alarmists who did not believe what they said imposed on those who did believe what they heard. The Church, to preserve its ascendancy, did what the landlords do to-day to preserve their interests. No doubt the territorialists have a sincere dread of Home Rule, but their interests and their conduct create the belief that it is more terror for themselves than for the State. If it be so, it is neither peculiar nor criminal—for other classes, when their unjust advantages are menaced, come to believe that should they be touched the State itself will collapse.

If there be popular sympathy for the cause of Ireland, that is important, seeing that there now exists a popular franchise to give effect to it. Lord Salisbury says the franchise is with him, and that it gave him a "mandate" of coercive action. If he believes this, he is an ill-appreciated man, for he has a gift of credulity beyond all human estimate. The people did not like Mr. Parnell much, but they liked Lord Salisbury less. The Tories who, as Mr. Bright is fond of saying, have been frequently "convicted," govern merely by a ticket-of-leave from the "Unionists," which will be called in at the next election.

The question of giving the control of purely Irish affairs to the Irish people was never at the poll before the last election. Ireland did not succeed, and it would have been the wonder of the century

if it had. Its failure was owing to indignation and ignorance—indignation which Ireland had excited against itself, and ignorance that Home Rule alone could bring unity.

If any one would understand the significance of the popular sympathy which now prevails, let him weigh the provocations of dislike which only a year or two ago existed.

The character of Irish leaders has changed in this generation. Emigration has done it. Finding the liberty, equality, and prosperity abroad, denied them at home; the news of it made the people at home intelligent and impatient. The Irish nature is capable of greater generosity and greater animosity than any other nature known. Despair excited its hostility, and its hostility imposed no limits on its detestation. It may be our fault that repellant advocates came forward. The contempt, dependence and hopelessness, which has been the lot of Irishmen under English rule may well have poisoned their blood. For years they did their best to prejudice the British elector against them. The Irish were not only not liked—they were disliked. It was part of their policy to make themselves disliked—and they succeeded. They acted on Jeremy Bentham's pernicious maxim—pernicious, if taken without regard to the time and circumstances under which he gave it—namely, "that to gain any public end you must make the ruling powers uneasy." This covers irritation, denunciation, defiance, insult, insurrection. This policy might be justifiable under a government of boroughmongers, a terrorized press, penal disqualification, and tyranny without redress. The policy of irritation is generally dangerous for a minority to adopt. Hatred begets hatred, and the stronger are apt to stamp out the weaker.

With a free press, a free platform, free voting, and a free Parliament, with the fifty representatives in it which they had then—many thought that a people who could not win freedom with such opportunities did not know its own business. Believing they had nothing to hope, the Irish leaders thought there was nothing to fear. The old wit, which sent laughter through the land, flashed no more; orators of the old classic eloquence, who arrested attention, compelled admiration in the indifferent, and filled the hearts of adversaries with remorse and respect, were succeeded by sombre agitators who lowered the great Parliament in which they sat. Mr. Bright, so often generous, was indignant and unforgiving. A Quaker always finds it harder to forgive than other men, because, having a passion for justice himself, he resents its disregard by others, and because he has an "inner light" which he takes to be unerring—while the outer light of other men is only commensurate with their accuracy of sight and range of facts. Home Rule—the instinct and pride of Englishmen, and the element of growth and safety in every nation capable of life and progress—Mr. Bright became persuaded was a dangerous

gift to Ireland, and protested he would be no party to a "surrender," as though such surrender was a crime—forgetful that every act of justice is a "surrender" of wrong. It does go against a man of spirit to concede even justice to those who do not scruple to demand it offensively. It is against the national sense of self-respect to describe or think any class of our countrymen base. And it is just to remember that gentlemen as well as workmen will show resentment under hateful accusation. Lord Montague, speaking in the House of Lords in Queen Elizabeth's days, exclaimed: "Understanding may be persuaded, but not forced. What man is there so without courage and stomach, or void of all honour, that he will swear that he thinketh the contrary to what he thinketh?" Irish leaders had made the British elector "think" very evilly of them, and thousands found it repugnant and impossible to say at the poll the contrary of what they thought.

Irish leaders have to thank themselves that this distrust prevailed. What Englishman can approach the House of Commons without shame and indignation? Its corridors and cellars are crowded with detectives. Electors are only admitted to the lobbies with criminal precaution. St. Stephen's, which for eight centuries has been as open and fearless as English courage, now has its cowardly doors closed because an Irish dynamiter once crept about the hall; while the Parliament Houses of Ottawa, ten times more exposed and oftener attacked by the same emissaries, suffer no restriction caused by terror to degrade them in the eyes of the foreigner who visits the capital. It is not wonderful if thousands of electors, at the ballot-box, hated the Irish who furnished a pretext for this humiliation.

This was not all. They endeavoured to destroy English Liberalism at the poll. When did the Tories do anything for Ireland? When did they not oppose every Liberal measure intended for Irish advantage, and defame and denounce the Minister who proposed it? Who created and sustained the always hated "Castle" Government in Dublin—but the Tories? Yet the Irish had voted for them and against the Liberals who had borne indignity and despite in defence of the Irish cause. Could the British elector forget all this within six months? Could he forget so soon that Irish Liberals had done their best to subject him to the disastrous rule of the Tories. Could he become all at once enthusiastic to vote for the freedom of his Irish electoral enemy?

Yet within a few months of the Irish doing this it came to pass that the British elector was asked to vote for them. The time between these things and the election was too short in which to let

"True reconciliation grow,
Where wounds of deadly hate
Had pierced so deep."

The masses scarcely knew whom they detested most—the authors

of these outrages or the Tory party whose policy had produced them, and while they hesitated at the poll, Lord Salisbury slipped into office with Unionist connivance, and he calls this having the "mandate" of the people. It is not often that passion and resentment on the part of the people diminish their sympathy for a struggling nation, but it did so at the last election. It implied a noble sympathy then that nearly one-half of all the votes recorded¹ should be given to Ireland, and implied intelligence and generosity in the "masses" who thus voted for it, sufficient to make the Irish and British people friends for evermore, as they will be. The conduct of the Irish in voting for Tories does not seem so bad as it looked, now Liberal "Unionists" do the same thing. The Irish members had the excuse of having but a forlorn hope before them. The English Unionists were in no such strait.

The English people have taken it into their heads now, that the Irish nation is treated ill in a degree that discredits England in the eyes of foreigners. Irishmen may not be all we wish, but we have made them what they are. In a procession of 100,000 in London, 40,000 men and women may be observed wearing the green. This has never before been seen in England. The outrage of evictions for rent which was never due in equity, and the intentional humiliation of gentlemen to deter them from taking the part of the people, have dulled the wonder that some men have been driven to try assassination. If Englishmen had been so treated they would have committed it, and none who had similarly suffered would have been eager to testify against them. The onslaught in Trafalgar Square, when armed men killed unarmed men and wounded 500, and the authorities refused to give the names of the assailants, led Englishmen to think that the Irish people who refused to give up their friendless countrymen, were less criminal than opulent authority which shielded police crimes. In this and many other ways popular sympathy has inclined to Ireland.

It is singular that after the secession of the Liberals it was Mr. Bright who first turned popular feeling in favour of the Irish by representing those who took sides with Mr. Gladstone, as being so many Cook's tourists, "personally conducted." What is genius and great political experience for, except to "personally conduct" those who are without it? Happy are they, who, less gifted, are "personally conducted" by those who are known to know and can be trusted. Does not every great teacher "personally conduct" all whom he instructs and influences? In no Parliament are there more than fifty men showing commanding capacity for public affairs, and do not they "personally conduct" the House, and fortunate is the

¹ The total votes given were 2,755,190, of which Tories and Unionists in alliance obtained 1,416,472, and Mr. Gladstone for Irish Justice 1,338,718, within 78,000 of being half the electors voting.

House that has as many members within it capable of doing it. Mr. Bright has "personally conducted" the Liberal party for many years, and we were proud to follow him as we are proud to follow Mr. Gladstone, and as we shall follow Mr. Bright again, where our judgment goes with his policy. He and Mr. Chamberlain will not cease to be regarded with honour and gratitude for what they have done. Ceasing to serve can never cancel priceless service rendered.

Nevertheless, Mr. Bright's singular disparagement of those who followed the leading of the wise, excited suspicion that dissent from Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy denoted some change in the habit of Liberal judgment. It had been plain for many years that all who had class interests to preserve distrusted Mr. Gladstone, because when he became convinced that a thing was right he took increasing trouble to give effect to his conviction; and neither neglect, nor ingratitude, nor enmity, deterred him from doing what he conceived to be just. It was apparent now that all who had motives for displacing him or destroying him, were encouraged by the action of those who called themselves "Unionists." All these were ready for anything which could bring mischief to the great Minister. When this came to be perceived the gratitude of the people was moved to sympathy, not only towards Mr. Gladstone, but towards the country which he was the first Minister to befriend, and which had so many interested enemies.

Prejudice, the spider of the mind, weaves webs that shut out light. The minds of the governing classes are full of Irish spiders; but the minds of the people are not troubled with them. They have lived themselves under the statemanship of hatred, and know the retaliation it generates. Ben Jonson wrote—

"There is a way of winning more by love than fear,
Force works on servile natures, not the free."

They thought force had had its day, and that Mr. Gladstone was right in acting on Garibaldi's advice and trying justice; and, therefore, sympathy went out to Ireland.

If a physician had prescribed the same remedy twenty times, his patient always growing worse, he would be thought, not merely incompetent, but mad. When the people saw statesmen who, after coercion had been prescribed eighty-six times, and the country aggravated and depraved by it, prescribed it for the eighty-seventh time, their sympathy was excited for a people made the subject of so many futile and murderous experiments.

Next, the country was told that self-government was denied to Ireland because the Parliament of boroughmongers chosen under a corrupt and limited suffrage, had bottomless rottenness, although it was well known that the rottenness was English made. If unfitness for freedom be an argument against it, no people

would ever obtain it. If a nation be not fit for self-government, the only remedy is to let it learn fitness. To say that the Irish are not to have municipal power until they know how to use it, is to reason like Macaulay's fool, who said he would never go into the water until he had learned to swim. No sensible and impartial person could fail to feel sympathy towards a country so treated.

The English people were further moved in favour of Irish self-government by a knowledge of the facts of Irish history and government lately diffused abroad, of which, before, they were unaware, or to which they had no strenuous motive for giving attention. The Irish people, brought up without municipal training, are demoralized, and demoralize, more or less, every community in other lands which admits them to citizenship. Everywhere they have been a reproach to England. Wherever they find government they have been "agin it," because the only government they have known at home has always been "agin" them. Because the Irish have, in self-defence, been law-breakers, they are thought to be law-haters. They break Saxon-made laws, but they will not permit their own laws to be broken when they make them themselves. This is seen in Land League laws, to which their obedience is as "thorough" as Strafford could wish it. Even a century ago, Arthur Young tells us, "The Whiteboys lasted ten years. Very remarkable was the surprising intelligence among the insurgents, wherever found. It was universal and almost instantaneous. The numerous bodies of them, at whatever distance from each other, seemed animated by one zeal, and not a single instance was known, in that long course of time, of a single individual betraying the cause. The severest threats and the most splendid promises of reward had no other effect than to draw closer the bonds which cemented a multitude apparently so desultory. Acts were passed for their punishment which seemed calculated for the meridian of Barbary. . . . Yet the real cause of the disease lay in those who passed the Acts, and not in the wretches they doomed to the gallows." Young exclaims, "Let the rulers change their own conduct entirely, and the poor will not long riot. Treat them like men who ought to be free as yourselves." The working-classes in England have not until late been so well treated or well trusted by their own rulers as not to understand this. There will no doubt be tyranny in Ireland when it has its own fortunes in its own hands: we are not without it in England. But the Irish may say, with Byron—

"Tyrants—but our masters then
Will be at least our countrymen."

The English working-class would not be human if they did not acquire sympathy for a country of so many misfortunes. They see that the restlessness of Ireland is not causeless. The people of that country have endured for 700 years what would make Englishmen

mad in a month. From the early days of their English master the Irish had reasons for resentment. Chaucer invented an Irish parentage for Wicked Tongue—

“So full of cursèd rage
It well agreed with his lineáge;
For him an Irish-woman bare.”

There is no argument against the permanence of liberty and union in Ireland, save the language of Irish leaders when they despaired of liberty, and terms of revenge were the only consolations of their pride.

“It does give some sense of power and passion
In helpless impotence to fashion
Defiant words, howe’er uncouth.”

What was the characteristic of Birmingham as late as 1839—before Mr. Bright knew it, and when Mr. Chamberlain was at school? The “friends of the people,” as they called themselves, after the manner of Marat, were listened to with greedy ears. The wilder the speeches the more they were applauded, because their extravagance implied sympathy and indignation. With their audiences despair was hereditary. Invasion itself would have excited but acquiescence, or, peradventure, welcome, such as the Berlineese gave when Bonaparte entered their city. In any change of masters there was hope, since the prospects of the working-class could not, it was thought, be worse. Then fairness was regarded as feebleness. There was nothing too mad to be believed, nothing too malignant to be said, and that, not of alien rule, but of a class in the same town. Hundreds made arms secretly. Passive spectators of the riots and the fires of the Bull Ring did not wonder at their occurrence. Whoever judges the capacity of Birmingham for freedom, tolerance, and self-government by the language and acts of that time would judge it as Ireland is judged to-day. The Irish revolt at the inferiority of treatment to which they are subjected in every part of the world, because their country has no equal place in the family of nations. Mr. H. L. Godkin, editor of the *Nation*, New York, has told us of this. Accord Irish people the means and dignity of self-government, and they will become our proud and equal allies; and there can be no valid alliance and no unity save between equals.

Every discussion-class Radical knows that the ill-feeling of the Irish has the same basis as had that of the French, when England sought to control their internal affairs. In the Jesuit School at Kensington, to which Sheil was sent to be educated in 1805, there were French West Indians, and little French emigrants from Paris, without a groat in their pockets. The boys, whose fathers had been expelled from France by the Revolution, and to whom England had afforded

helter and given bread, manifested the ancient national antipathy to England as strongly as though they had never been nursed at her bosom and obtained their aliment from her bounty. Whenever news arrived of a victory by Bonaparte, "I can never forget," said Sheil, "the exultation with which the sons of the decapitated, or the exiled, hailed the triumph of the French arms and the humiliation of England."¹

English legislation, which prohibited Irish trade and commerce when the people were disposed to engage in them, killed the sentiment of industry in the land, and made the nation mendicant. It is known in every workman's family, that youths reared without occupation, or due reward for their industry, become demoralized and shiftless, hopeless and reckless. So does a nation when treated in the same way. It is thus that more knowledge and more reflection has produced a sympathy for Ireland unfelt before. At the last election many farm-hands were turned against the Irish by being told the result of Home Rule would be that the Irish would come over to England in greater numbers than ever, and underbid them in the harvest-field. The farmers who said this encouraged the Irish all the while to come over—they being in favour of "Irish Cheap Labour," and these farmers feared Home Rule because it would render Ireland a country in which its people would have reasons for remaining. The farm-hands were too ignorant to see this. The Irish have no taste for being driven out of their own country, to hawk their labour about England and make themselves hated by their fellow labourers here. Thus the English labourer is prejudiced against the Irish. What Free Traders were to the farmers, the Irish were to the farm labourers. This ignorance has ended now, and sympathy has taken its place.

Neither in town nor country could any workmen be found at the last election who believed that Home Rule implied separation, nor did any believe that anybody else believed it. When Lord Grey de Wilton was addressing the electors at Gorton, he said "he had always been in favour of the Union." "Yes," answered one of them, "we all know that your sort be in favour of the Union"—meaning the workhouse.

When the late Parliament met, Mr. Gladstone was called upon, on all sides, to say what he would do. Having explained what he would do, he took steps to do it, as an honest Premier should. This precipitated an election, and then he was charged with causing "disruption." The disruption of party is no new thing. The Anti-Corn Law League was a disruptor. Liberals were advised by Mr. Cobden to vote for Tories who would vote for the League. In the late Presidential election in America, the Cobden Club gave their influence on the side of the Tory President, Cleveland, whose party

¹ Macnevin's *Life of R. L. Sheil*, p. 9.

favoured Free Trade, and against the Republican candidate, Blaine, because he befriended Protection. The opponents of Free Trade in England had "conscientious convictions." They saw not only dismemberment, but ruin of the nation, in Free Trade. Their "independent convictions" did not save them from being thrust aside at the poll. Members of Parliament, and Governments also, go down when their honest scruples are opposed to the necessities of national progress. Then members are "made into delegates" without hesitation. The will of the people can only be expressed by those who represent it. They who most complain of others acting on their convictions, act resolutely and remorselessly upon their own. We question neither their motives, nor their patriotism, nor their sincerity. But the duty of acting on honest belief is the obligation of both sides upon a great question, and is neither intolerance, nor ingratitude, nor political crime.

The lost Home Rule Bill was the first bill introduced into the English Parliament this century which touched the Irish heart. The people shared none of the trepidation of those who told them that Home Rule was "sprung upon" them. What must the Irish people think, to be told, after eighty-six years of hunger for nationality, that the proposal of it comes all too soon. If it be "sprung" upon us, that is the mercy of it. There are those of us who remember when it took ten years of agitation of a right before we could find an adventurous Member of Parliament to put a question upon it "in the House," and ten years more passed over our heads before we could hope to see a Bill brought in to give effect to it, and none of us expected to live long enough to see it carried. Now the happy day has come when great reforms are "sprung upon us." The people saw in Mr. Gladstone the first Premier of England who ever had any "spring" in him. They would be imbecile did not this excite their admiration.

Nobody denies that landlordism and the coercion necessary to collect the landlord's ruinous rents have been a fruitful cause of Irish alienation. Mr. Gladstone's proposal to buy out the landlords by the method he devised, would have been economy. Ireland is to us what slavery was to America. Had there been a great statesman in that country, who had made the extinction of slavery a Government question, every slave in the United States might have been freed for less than his weight in silver. In the noble but profligate war that ensued, the American people paid their full weight in gold for their emancipation, and gave a million lives of their own citizens besides. Even Tories put out placards calling upon country electors "to vote against giving 150 millions to Irish landlords." As there will never be another offer made of that kind, this injunction was taken as approving of confiscation of landlord property. It was sanctioning a "No-Rent" vote in England. Tories and "Unionists" have

planted that doctrine where it will grow. Anyhow it produced sympathy for the Plan of Campaign which was at least more honest than the Unionist proposal.

The *Times* went mad, beyond the power of M. Pasteur to save it, raved every morning, and has been trying ever since to bite the working-classes without succeeding. Their sympathy has saved them.

With a grossness of imputation which Rossa or an Anarchist would envy, the *Times* charged Mr. Gladstone with *intending* separation, disunion, dismemberment and the effacement from the national flag of the arms of Ireland. The people saw that the opposite was true, and that Mr. Gladstone's measures were designed to prevent these things occurring. Those who differed from Mr. Gladstone's measures might think they would tend to the evils they described. But tendency is not intention.

Not this alone, but the charges made in "Parnellism and Crime" provoked a contempt out of which large sympathies sprang. When the charges were repeated in Parliament, and the Irish members demanded inquiry, it was denied. Even the Liberal Unionists voted against it. English gentlemen never before were known to bring deadly charges and refuse to meet the challenge of the accused. Every honest man of English spirit gave his sympathy to a party whose accusers acted in a manner which, in Irishmen, would be described as proceeding from venom and cowardice.

Popular sympathy with Ireland is not discouraged by the virulence with which Irish leaders are assailed. Not many years ago Mr. Bright was denounced in the House of Commons as Mr. Parnell is now. For two sessions there was no Tory speaker who did not say something contemptuous or insulting of Mr. Bright. If any man was concerned in any cause Mr. Bright had defended, he was assailed with the same offensiveness, until Mr. Bright's approval of anything ensured its condemnation. Yet all the while these demonstrative speakers had made up their minds to accept the great extension of which Mr. Bright was the great advocate. This noisome rancour was emitted to conceal their retreat. Any one might have applied to the Opposition the lines in which Whittier described the collapse of the Copperheads in America:—

"Not all at once did the skunk curl up,
We saw it bounce and heard it lie;
But all the while it was looking about
For a hole in which to die."

It must be owned that the English taxpayer is moved somewhat by sympathy for himself. He no longer sees what advantage it is to a commercial nation like England, which has need of economy in taxation, to pay eight millions a year to prevent the Irish people managing their own affairs—for, all things counted, it does not cost

us less. He objects to having to pay the expense of a perpetual war in Ireland in order to collect the unjust rents of landlords.

All this century the English people have heard reproaches of French Revolutionists for their treatment of their King. Burke called upon the swords of Europe to leap from their scabbards to avenge the detention of an intriguing Queen. But King and Queen had a large roomy prison. The King could have wife and family around him, and nothing to do. All could sit up as long as they pleased, and rise when they chose. While, in Ireland, gentlemen, kingly in the regard of the nation, are imprisoned with rigour, put to degrading labour, subjected to privation and outrage, and the indignity put upon them made the subject of ribald jest by Lord Salisbury—the like of which has not been heard since the brutal days when Canning described a political opponent as “the revered and ruptured Ogden.” By the side of the Tory-Unionists’ Government the French Revolutionists were gentlemen of delicacy and good feeling. The sympathy of every man of self-respect must go out to Ireland.

The Unionists confirm and increase it. In America when a man supports principles opposed to those he professes to hold he is called a political crank. This is what the Dissident Liberals have done. Liberalism no longer knows its ere-time leaders. Their voice is changed. Milton describes another famous group, who unexpectedly found that an evil alliance had consequences. When Lucifer, before his followers—

“ . . . stood, expecting
Their universal shout and high applause
To fill his ear ; when, contrary, he hears
 the sound
Of public scorn : he wondered, but not long
Had leisure, wondering at himself now more ;
His visage drawn he felt to sharp and spare ;
His arms clung to his ribs, his legs entwining
Each other, till supplanted down he fell
* * * * *
Reluctant, but in vain ; a greater power
Now ruled him.
 He would have spoke,
But hiss for hiss returned with forked tongue
To forked tongue, for now were all transformed
Alike, to serpents all, as accessories
To his bold riot :
 horror on them fell,
And horrid sympathy ; for what they saw,
They felt themselves now changing ; down their
Down fell both spear and shield, down they as fell
And the dire form
Caught by contagion,
 Thus was the applause they meet
Turned to exploding hiss, triumph to shame
Cast on themselves from their own mouths.”

These celebrated Dissident angels were not more changed from what they were than are the Liberal Unionists from what we knew them, before they enlisted in the Tory service. No matter. Since Mr. Gladstone has given the imperishable country the splendid offer of nationality, unforeseen speeches of gratitude have been heard, which show that Irish leaders are still capable of the nobler manner. They have no longer to resent reluctant, peddling, and dubious amelioration. Self-government has been made inevitable by the great Minister who is their friend; and what Mr. Huntly McCarthy describes as the "sunless centuries" are over. Let those friendly to Ireland who have anger think of it at the ballot-box. It is the essence of Liberalism to be obedient to the law, but not to allow any class of men to stand up and say they are the law. The business of Liberals is to stand by their principles. St. Augustine said: "Men should work as though there was no help in heaven, and pray as though there was no help in themselves." Let all Liberals, by having no animosity, rancour, or vituperation for any who have ceased to stand on their side, make it possible for adversaries to help them; but, at the same time, always working as though there were no help in anybody but themselves; and their sympathy for Ireland, which is real now, will be practical and effective.

POVERTY.

AMONG the various social problems connected with the advance of modern civilization there is not one which receives, or, indeed, which demands, more serious attention than that which deals with the numerous and varied evils resulting from extreme poverty. At the present time there is no civilized country of any importance which is not to some extent beset by difficulties and dangers arising out of the discontent and more or less ill-defined aspirations of the poor. On every hand the conviction seems to be gaining ground among those constituting the lower strata of society that they have just cause for complaint against the existing order of things, and that their inability to improve their position is due either to the selfishness, injustice, and folly of the classes above them, or to certain alleged defects in the social and political systems amid which they live. The wild and incoherent ravings of the Russian Nihilists, and the vague complaints and shadowy schemes of those who term themselves Socialists and Anarchists in Western Europe and the United States of America, are based in the main upon one general idea, and this consists in the assumption that the ills endured by the lower grades of society are the results of injustice and oppression, and that, therefore, some artificial method of counteracting them is to be found. As regards the reality of these ills it is unnecessary to speak, for on this point there is, unfortunately, no room for discussion. They are only too manifest, and, what is worse, they seem almost to keep pace in growth with the advance of civilization itself. Every year adds visibly to the general prosperity and enlightenment of the world, and increases man's power of controlling the forces and physical conditions by which he is surrounded; but, notwithstanding these advantages, there seems thus far to be no perceptible diminution in the proportion of those who are engaged in a dreary and monotonous struggle for the bare means of existence. Upon the various phases of misery and wretchedness consequent on this condition of things it is unnecessary to enlarge, as they are familiar to us all. Every man admits their reality, and it is only when the question of remedies arises that opinions begin to differ. Here all seems to be uncertainty and doubt, for the means suggested for improvement are well-nigh endless in variety and number.

Whilst extreme reformers of the Nihilist and Anarchist types

maintain that the chief requisite is to destroy the existing order of things in order to have a clear space for the reconstruction of society upon a new basis, those whose convictions are less thorough profess to have discovered the causes of the world's miseries in a great variety of sources. The imperfections of political institutions, the unfair incidence of taxation, the uncontrolled influence of competition, the tyranny of capital, the absence of restrictions upon the accumulation of wealth by individuals, the want of regulations affecting the hours of labour, the defects in systems of land tenure—these and many other causes too numerous to mention are again and again pointed out as the influences to which the great social ills of modern times must be attributed, and in the reforms and amendments these faults and deficiencies seem to demand we are assured that the means of escape are to be found. The mere diversity of the remedies proposed shows how great is the uncertainty that prevails with respect to the origin of what may be termed the material miseries of life; in fact, upon one point only can there be said to be anything like unanimity of opinion, and that is the assumption that the evils are curable. And here the agreement is certainly well justified, for in the natural conditions surrounding man's lot there is nothing which renders it inevitable that any appreciable proportion of the human race shall be doomed to remain the sport of every adverse circumstance as is at present the case. So far as the conditions are concerned, it is within the limits of possibility that every man shall live in practical security against all the hardships attendant on poverty; and, although such a contingency may appear altogether visionary and utopian, a consideration of the circumstances under which its realization would be possible might be useful as a means of indicating the true sources of the ills at present endured.

By a large number of persons the grinding poverty, and all its attendant misery, vice, and wretchedness, which exist like plague-spots even in the midst of the most civilized nations, are looked upon as a portion of the misfortunes inseparable from man's lot. But the victims of these sorrows, as we have already remarked, are beginning to manifest a decided inclination to question the soundness of such a theory. To them the problem is as bitter as it is perplexing; and, as they are naturally unwilling to adopt a solution which would place any part of the responsibility for its existence upon their own shoulders, they are compelled to call in question the justice of existing arrangements and institutions. They are disposed to cut the Gordian knot by assuming that equity demands a more equal distribution of wealth, and that those who possess more than their proportionate share of means must have gained their advantage by trespassing on the rights of their less fortunate neighbours. There is a steadily growing belief that the poor have a just cause for complaint against society generally; and, although the conviction that such is

the case may still be somewhat vague and indefinite, it already exerts a considerable influence, not only upon the opinions of the poor themselves, but also upon those of some of their most ardent champions. The spectacle presented by the social condition of our great cities, the harsh contrast between the luxury and the debasing penury and squalor which surround different sections of their inhabitants, are only too well known. They have been dilated upon and described until the very reference to them seems trite and commonplace. But the noteworthy fact about the reflections of those who descant most freely upon such phenomena is the similarity of the inferences left to be drawn therefrom. They almost invariably point to the conclusion that the responsibility for these extreme differences rests mainly upon the shoulders of the more favoured sections of society. Their authors, it is true, usually imply rather than express reproach. They refer to these inequalities chiefly by insinuations, and carefully avoid entering into particulars which might prove embarrassing to the conclusions at which they desire to arrive. It is difficult to assail the easy-going economists who proceed in this manner, seeing that they rarely make explicit charges, or state expressly the kind of remedies they have to suggest. In fact, it is clear that in the majority of cases they have none to offer. Actuated in some instances by mere unreflecting sympathy, and in others by the knowledge that their comments will find a grateful echo in thousands of hearts, they proceed to compare the superabundance of wealth enjoyed by one class of society with the hardships endured by another, and then to suggest whether the contrast does not imply the existence of a positive injustice. At the first glance this form of argument, if such it may be called, may appear harmless enough; but if it has nothing like a solid foundation in fact, its influence must be highly pernicious, seeing that it can serve only to draw attention from the quarter in which the true sources of the evil are to be found.

It is a fact worthy of note that in most ages poverty has been regarded as something akin to virtue, or at all events as a qualification entitling its victims to a degree of sympathy closely bordering on esteem. That such should have been the case is perhaps natural, for this view of the subject has proved acceptable to rich and poor alike. To the former it has afforded a convenient opportunity for exercising the noblest feelings of which human nature is possessed, while to the latter it has presented a sure and easy means of securing compassion and pity. Nor must it be forgotten that the glorification of poverty, without any reference or regard to the causes by which it may have been produced, holds a prominent place in the principal systems of morality hitherto adopted. It is true there are few persons at the present day who actually shun the possession of wealth, or who give any practical heed to the theory that it constitutes a moral disadvantage; still, it is impossible that this view of

the question can have been embodied as one of the leading tenets of great religious faiths without having exerted a deep and far-reaching influence on the popular estimate of the problem. It is unnecessary here to enlarge on the economical fallacies which have been advocated in the name of the Christian religion. They must be apparent to any man who can examine the subject without bias. From a religious point of view, the love of money and the possession of great riches have generally been deprecated, if not actually held up to scorn; yet, as a matter of fact, the desire for wealth has played a most important part in furthering the general advancement of mankind. These unsound principles were, of course, laid down at a time when economical truths were absolutely unknown; but even at the present day they retain a considerable degree of vitality, and it will be long before the prejudicial effects they have produced will cease to be felt. Men are naturally inclined to improvidence and a want of foresight, and the constant assurances they have in all ages received to the effect that such characteristics are closely allied to virtues have greatly interfered with their subdual.

The laws governing the material prosperity of society were not discovered until comparatively modern times, and even since they have been theoretically made known it cannot be said that they have received much practical recognition. As we have already pointed out, the disadvantages attendant on extreme poverty are now usually traced to causes which apparently lie within reach of legislative amendment, while the true sources of the evil are left unnoticed. There are few persons who would be prepared to admit that they themselves are at all responsible for the existence of the particular class of ills here alluded to, yet, as a matter of fact, those who are altogether free from blame are probably in a minority. There is nothing mysterious or inexplicable about the origin of the material miseries which form such a heavy drag upon the world's progress. They arise in the main from causes of a simple character, but, for all that, the prospect of their general abatement is still very limited. If the failings which constitute the causes are clear and unmistakable, they are so widely spread as to be practically universal, and it is this fact which constitutes the real barrier to improvement. They consist almost exclusively in a deficiency of foresight and of self-control, and these defects are so general that their proper condemnation is at present impossible. In some of their phases they are regarded as estimable traits of character rather than as faults; in others they are classed as failings to be mildly regretted; but seldom are they held to call for anything like serious moral censure. Provided a man does not break any of the written laws of society, he may lead what is really nothing more than a kind of animal life of self-indulgence, bringing himself and those dependent upon him into a condition of misery and destitution, and still be looked upon

by society generally as a victim of mere thoughtlessness. He will receive more sympathy than reproach. Yet, if he were judged according to the consequences of his failings, he would have to take rank among the worst of moral offenders. Poverty may well be termed the mother of vice; and the question whether it is a crime, so often asked with indignation by those who profess to espouse the cause of its victims, ought, in a large number of instances, to be answered in the affirmative.

A considerable proportion of the human race persistently ignore the laws and physical conditions to which man's tenure of the world is subject. Yet these are not to be set at defiance with impunity. The written and unwritten moral codes which society has thus far adopted demand the exercise of a very limited degree of either sagacity or self-denial, and, outside these limits, men may live and act as instinct or inclination suggests. But sad and bitter are the consequences resulting from such an easily obeyed system of morality. The worst misfortune is that these consequences have not always to be borne by their authors. In too many instances they are absorbed by the broad surface of society, while the actual offenders escape with only a slight share of the penalty; and this fact has no doubt done much to retard the development of a sounder system of practical ethics, for, had the case been otherwise, it is evident that self-interest would long since have brought about an amendment.

The widely spread and deeply rooted character of the failings which constitute the predisposing causes of the material sufferings endured by so large a proportion of the inhabitants of almost all civilized countries does not, however, form the only barrier to their amendment. There are certain considerations incidental to their opposing virtues which also assist very materially in perpetuating their existence. Imprudence and the insufficient exercise of self-control are doubtless the chief sources of the great social ills at present endured, but it must be admitted that the moral qualities which form the opposites of these characteristics are to some extent deservedly held in disrepute. Habits of prudence are often found in conjunction with peculiarities by no means deserving of esteem, whilst their absence is not unfrequently compensated by traits of character which are decidedly agreeable to contemplate. Hence it is that thrift, for example, is sometimes described as a selfish virtue, and that it has come to be regarded by many persons with tacit mistrust. The man who takes no thought for the future is often as remarkable for his generosity and good nature as he is for the folly he displays with respect to his own interests; while the individual who never loses sight of this latter consideration runs a serious risk of distinguishing himself by his deficiency in these amiable qualities. Prudence undoubtedly has a tendency to degenerate into selfishness and avarice—generosity into imprudence and folly—and the path of virtue lies,

as usual, between the two extremes. Nor must it be forgotten that the considerations urged in favour of the exercise of prudential habits are not always of a very elevated character. Too much stress is laid upon the personal benefits and advantages likely to accrue from the display of judicious foresight, and too little attention is paid to the widespread and disastrous consequences resulting from its absence. Not unfrequently it appears to be taken for granted, especially in this country, that the hoarding of money or the accumulation of great wealth is the chief end and aim of human existence. Instances of men who have raised themselves from a state of poverty to one of affluence are held up as examples worthy of imitation, while the grievous wrongs inflicted on society by the thriftless and improvident are either forgotten or passed over as matters of only secondary importance. That these motives to right conduct are somewhat base and sordid can hardly be questioned; and, although it may be that, by appealing thus directly to human selfishness, they have exerted some amount of beneficial influence, it is highly probable that, if attention had been directed more strongly to the duty men owe to their fellows as well as to themselves, the general results would have been more satisfactory.

The principle on which the material well-being of any community depends rests within a very narrow compass. The fact that such large numbers of the inhabitants of this and of most other countries are living either destitute or on the brink of poverty is due to no mysterious or hidden agency. It arises from errors of the plainest and most unmistakable character. Yet these errors are of such a kind that it seems to be the business of neither the moralist nor the economist to point out the nature of the remedies required. The former usually ignores the whole subject as not coming within the scope of his teaching, while the latter treats chiefly of the principles which govern the increase of wealth in the aggregate. But the case of our own country shows plainly that this is only a partial view of the problem. The fact that the total value of our exports and imports is increasing by so many millions sterling per annum can be no more than a piece of cold comfort to those who pass their lives in one unceasing struggle with poverty; while to the million paupers who are living on the forced contributions of their neighbours it must be a matter of no interest whatever. Great national prosperity does not necessarily signify a high degree of general welfare; and there can be no question that if the total wealth of this country were somewhat less, but at the same time more equally distributed, the general happiness of the community at large would be much greater than it is at the present time. The prime fallacy pervading the arguments, schemes, and theories which are constantly being brought forward for the removal of the evils connected with poverty consists in the assumption that they are to be remedied by artificial

measures. Almost universally it is taken for granted that means can be devised for staving off the consequences attendant on human folly. The burden of the penalty may be shifted from shoulder to shoulder, it is true; but to imagine that it can be altogether escaped is about as reasonable as to expect that a man may jump from the top of a precipice and still hope to defy the laws of gravitation. The facts are as simple in the one case as in the other. There are countless individuals who bring upon themselves responsibilities they are unable to meet, and, when these have to be dealt with, it is not surprising that a vast deal of inconvenience is the result. To suppose that this inconvenience can be avoided is nothing short of folly; and if this simple fact were kept constantly in view, it would do more to abate the evil than all the artificial schemes which have ever been propounded.

Economists are prone greatly to over-estimate the influence of written laws and social institutions, while philanthropists usually indulge in more or less vague declamations against the evils they perceive, and generously endeavour to provide temporary and artificial means for mitigating their worst effects. It would be idle to maintain that laws and institutions are without any influence in the question. The system of taxation, the laws of inheritance, the rules of land tenure, and the like unquestionably affect the material welfare of the people of every country, but the influence of all these combined is infinitesimal compared with that of individual conduct. The fact that there are one million paupers in this country, for example, or that there are always at least one hundred million people in India who are living within a measurable distance of actual famine, is not in either case to be attributed to defective laws or institutions. It arises almost entirely from the deficiency of prudential restraint. In the one case this quality is imperfectly developed; in the other it is altogether absent. Indeed, the case of India affords a good illustration of the failing here alluded to in its most unmitigated form. To the great majority of Hindoos prudence and foresight are practically unknown; and the result is that an unusual drought, and the consequent failure of the staple crop, are sufficient to bring the population of a whole district face to face with starvation. And the defects of character and conduct which produce such disastrous consequences in India may be seen working in a modified degree in this country. The phenomena to be witnessed there upon the failure of a season's rice crop may be seen in a milder form in any of our great manufacturing districts upon the sudden cessation of the staple branch of industry. In a few weeks, at the most, the bulk of the operatives will be reduced to a state of penury, and were it not for the forced or voluntary assistance they then receive large numbers of them would be in danger of starvation.

It is estimated by competent authorities that the annual earnings

of the working classes in this country amount to about £400,000,000, and that of this sum about £3,000,000, or something less than 1 per cent., is saved. It may perhaps be urged that these figures are only rough estimates, seeing that precise aggregate returns are unattainable; but, at all events, in the published returns of the various trade unions we have unquestionable evidence upon the subject. These unions comprise the flower of the labouring classes, and the results obtained by means of the machinery which they provide may therefore be regarded as the best which the working-man has thus far been able to secure. It is of course unnecessary to say that the object of the unions is to provide against sickness, old age, accident, and temporary want of employment, as well as to furnish the necessary organization for contesting disputes with employers upon the question of wages, and that they are in fact just as much provident societies as the insurance companies in which the middle classes make provision for future contingencies. Yet, upon reference to a Blue-Book¹ published last year, it will be seen that the total revenues of eighteen of the principal unions in the country amounted to about £520,000 for the year 1886, while their members numbered no less than 194,000. About 10 per cent. of the members appear to have been unemployed, and, if we deduct these from the total, we find that the rate of contributions per head from the paying members was not more than £3 for the year. Here, then, we have unquestionable evidence of the kind of economy practised by the best sections of the working classes. All the men in the unions referred to are skilled mechanics with wages which average certainly upwards of 30s. per week. And out of this they succeed in placing aside some £3 per annum as a provision against sickness, old age, accident, and want of employment. It is as though a man with an income of £500 a year which would terminate at his death or disablement were to spend regularly the whole of it within £20, and trust in fortune to provide for those dependent on him when disaster arrived. Of course such instances of criminal folly as this are to be found, but they are exceptional. Yet what would be an utterly reckless mode of life in one case seems to be deemed a sound system of conduct in the other. Of course members of trade societies often belong also to burial or benefit societies, but the average contribution to these is so small that the fact does not practically affect the conclusion to which we desire to point; and this is, that among the working classes as a rule the contribution of about a couple of weeks' wages per year to a provident fund is regarded as ample provision for the future. Any deficiency that may thereafter become manifest must be made good by the community at large.

This general omission of working-men to make anything like adequate provision against future contingencies does not arise from

¹ *Statistical Tables and Report on Trade Unions, 1887.*

pecuniary inability, for the figures we have just quoted refer to the best-paid class of mechanics and artisans. It is simply the disposition to exercise prudential restraint which is lacking. A great deal might be said as regards the want of sagacity shown in the management of the provident funds to which working-men contribute. To judge from the words of the compiler of the Trade Union Returns above quoted, it seems doubtful whether even these societies are established upon a sound basis, and whether they will eventually be able to meet the steadily increasing demands made upon them for superannuation benefit. Be this as it may, however, there can be no doubt that a considerable proportion of the benefit societies to which the general class of working-men contribute are on the high road to bankruptcy. The Registrar of Friendly Societies, in his Report published in 1880, stated that the majority of them were then in this condition, for out of 948 societies with 242,800 members the valuation returns of 560 showed a deficiency of £420,000. The bulk of their revenues seems to disappear in the cost of management. For example, the returns of eight societies for the previous year showed that, against £615,000 paid as "benefits" to members, £529,000 was paid as agents' commission and £295,000 as expenses of management. And, in calling attention to this point in his Report published in 1885, the Registrar stated that "it cannot be too frequently repeated that insurance in a great collecting burial society or industrial assurance company is the most costly form which such a provision can take, and that the persons who effect such insurances place themselves virtually at the mercy of others who are interested in getting as much out of them as they can." And after referring to the question of their total abolition and the substitution of a State system of assurance in their place, he adds:—

"Until this can be done, so long must they remain necessary evils. So long as the lowest classes of English society are unable or unwilling to make any other provision than for the expenses of their own burial or that of the members of their family, so long as they are too poor or too self-distrustful to make this provision otherwise than by weekly payments of a penny or a halfpenny, and at the same time either too busy or too lazy to carry their coppers to an office, so long do these collecting burial societies and companies supply a want, not the less real because it is in the main an unwholesome one."

These facts afford an insight into the kind of economy practised by the more provident of the labouring community; and, inadequate as their provision for the future may be, it is, at all events, some small improvement upon the complete absence of foresight displayed by the great majority of working-men. These simply do nothing for the future. They spend their weekly earnings with clock-like regularity, and are therefore the sport of every adverse wind that blows. It may, perhaps, be urged that the small amount of their wages does not permit of the exercise of thrift. But this is not the

case, for in whatever direction we look we shall find that the means for self-gratification and indulgence are always forthcoming. Ten times the amount saved is spent in drink, for example; and in addition to actually pernicious waste of this kind, there is the further drain in the shape of the ruinous loan system of which the poor allow themselves to become the victims, and in the extravagant prices they pay for articles of common consumption through habitually purchasing them in minute quantities. Of the heavy responsibilities they bring upon themselves by early and imprudent marriages it is necessary to speak only for the purpose of calling attention to the light in which this phase of the question is usually viewed. It seems to be assumed that every man has a natural right to marry as soon as he has reached the adult stage of life, and to burden himself with a family without any regard whatever either to his own ability to provide for them or to the requirements of the community in which he lives. It matters not that his own children become competitors with him in an already glutted labour market. They have to live. And when his reckless folly produces its inevitable crop of misery and woe, the responsibility of meeting these evils is thrown upon society generally as a matter of course, whilst their cause is sought for in some imaginary defect in the social system. The real author of all this sorrow will escape without incurring the smallest degree of moral censure, and without the risk of posing in any character other than that of the victim of uncontrollable circumstances.

As regards the social obligations of individuals, it seems quite clear that public opinion is still in a crude and imperfect state. It often estimates conduct without any reference to consequences; and, in the place of moral censure, it frequently comes forward with sympathy and flattering epithets for those whose weakness and indiscretion have contributed largely to the common stock of misery and suffering. In the practice of every-day life it seems to be taken for granted that men are under no moral obligation to exercise rational judgment in certain phases of their affairs. Provided they do not infringe the criminal law, and are not openly vicious, society is satisfied. Yet certain it is that far more misery results from the ill-judged conduct of those who are looked upon as the victims of unfavourable circumstances than from the crimes of the men who fill our gaols. This may seem a harsh statement, and its harshness will not be at all mitigated by the fact that it is incontrovertible. It is one of those truths, however, which public opinion prefers to leave in the background. The inevitable consequences of the follies and errors committed outside the narrow limits we have just referred to are classed, partly as misfortunes, partly as evils arising from some mysterious source which is beyond man's power to control, and partly as the result of the misdeeds and wrongs perpetrated in some inexplicable manner by one section of society against another. To call them by their true names and trace them to their true sources, is to

incur the risk of inviting charges of hard-heartedness and deficiency of sympathy ; and the reformer who wishes to avoid reproaches of this kind must be content to make a heavy compromise with human weakness, and endeavour simply to mitigate some of the evils to which it gives rise. It has come to be an accepted article of faith that the only practical method of dealing with the natural consequences of human folly is to ignore the methods of their production, to bestow flattering sympathy upon their authors, and to attempt to raise some kind of temporary shield against their disastrous influence. There are certain conventional hobbies which the practical reformer may parade, it is true. He may discuss the economical tendencies of various systems of taxation, land tenure, poor relief, &c. ; but he must bring no charge against the victims of poverty, or he will at once be regarded either as a mere doctrinaire whose opinions are unworthy of attention, or as a callous and unsympathetic economist.

In the field of politics the truth as regards this particular problem requires to be most carefully kept out of sight. If a man courts popular favour, it would be the height of folly for him to tell his supporters that their own conduct stands in need of any amendment. He must scrupulously avoid even a suspicion of censure, and, while doing his utmost to flatter their susceptibilities, he must either content himself with reiterating the shibboleths and meaningless watch-words of the party to which he belongs, or exaggerate the benefits which are likely to accrue from proposed amendments and reforms in the statute book, or in the re-adjustment of some fiscal burden. There is no politician living who would dare tell the voters at an election that their personal welfare is influenced to an immeasurably greater extent by their own conduct than by any possible reform in the laws and political institutions of their country. Yet that such is the case is absolutely certain. Practical politicians, when enlarging on the material advantages to be derived from the introduction of changes in the law, are compelled to ignore the fact that the civilized world still affords working examples of almost every kind of social and political system which human wisdom has yet devised, and that, in spite of this, there is no nation or community which can be said to have delivered itself from the incubus of misery and suffering resulting from extreme poverty. They may enlarge upon the advantages to be derived from some change in the incidence of taxation, but they must not remind their adherents that the sum annually wasted in foolish extravagance or positively vicious indulgence greatly exceeds the amount of the national revenue. These truths are of the class which it would be highly inexpedient for them to mention ; and the only safe course open to them is either to indulge in the more or less high-sounding platitudes of their respective parties, or to direct attention to the minor issues of the questions which seem to demand their notice.

In the face of these considerations, it becomes manifest how serious are the obstacles to anything like a real amendment in the material condition of the lower classes of society. In civilized countries the poor are unwilling to submit to the force of the unfavourable conditions, by which they find themselves surrounded, with the meekness and resignation which characterize the inhabitants of less advanced nations. They may live and act unwisely, but they resolutely adhere to the conviction that the cause of their misfortunes lies altogether beyond their own personal control. They are fully persuaded that the inequalities and anomalies now existing are capable of artificial re-adjustment, and hence their growing discontent and the increasing disposition they display to combine in the demand for a thorough re-construction of the social system. It is highly probable that, as opportunities offer, attempts will be made to eradicate extreme poverty, together with all its attendant ills, as it were by main force. Yet we may rest assured that all such efforts must end in failure. If men act injudiciously, whether through sheer perversity or folly, or unconsciously, there is a relentless fate which exacts the penalty. The payment of this may be shifted from class to class by means of artificial devices, it is true; but to suppose that it can be avoided is as unreasonable as to imagine that the laws of health can be set at defiance without entailing any evil consequences.

It may, perhaps, be urged that the statement of self-evident truths like these can be of no avail—that allowance must be made for the failings peculiar to human nature—and that the only practical method of dealing with the subject is to provide some kind of temporary remedy for the evils to which they give rise. To some extent this is doubtless true. In civilized communities it is impossible to allow human errors and shortcomings to produce what might be termed their natural consequences. Society generally must take upon itself a large share of the burden of these; and the extent to which it will do this will, in every case, be measured by its susceptibility for the hardships of its less fortunate members, and by its regard for its own safety and welfare. At the present day both of these motives are distinctly increasing in force. Public opinion is steadily becoming more sensitive to the suffering and misery consequent on extreme poverty, and more disposed to adopt measures for their mitigation and relief. At the same time it is being forcibly impelled in the same directions by the ominous murmurings of those who are beginning to question the justice of the existing order of things and to advocate the adoption of more or less drastic measures of reform. On all sides there seems to be a general agreement to ignore the real sources of the evil. The facts connected with this great social problem are usually assumed to lie among the class of truths which “fools do not perceive and wise men do not mention,” and the prospect of a radical amendment is therefore somewhat remote. And it seems likely that a long time must elapse before the causes of all these

disorders can undergo any serious mitigation. Society is unwilling to accuse the authors of its misfortunes, and the only hope of escape appears to lie in the development of a sounder system of life as a consequence of the growth which is slowly but surely taking place in common sagacity among the poor.

It must not be forgotten, however, that the final solution of the problem does not rest with the people of any particular country. Modern facilities for locomotion and for the exchange of commercial products have, to a great extent, annihilated distance and brought the inhabitants of the whole world into some kind of competition with each other; and one result of this state of things is to impose a drag upon the further progress of the more advanced communities. A high rate of wages, for example, is an indispensable condition to the material welfare of the working classes in any country, and it is evident that, so long as migration and commercial exchange are unimpeded, the wage rate must be subject to a certain levelling influence. Practical illustrations of this may be seen in the United States and in certain of the Australian colonies, where the influx of Chinese immigrants is producing an unfavourable effect upon the condition of the labour market, the low standard of well-being with which the Chinaman is content enabling him to work for wages which are totally insufficient to provide the degree of comfort to which the European is accustomed. And a modified influence of a similar kind may be seen at work in this country in the competition of Continental with British labour; the longer hours of work and the lower rates of pay in force in many branches of industry upon the Continent, and the constant stream of immigrants who are tempted from certain poverty-stricken districts in Europe to England by the hope of improving their condition, both tending to reduce the position of the British artisan to the common level of his fellows.

These considerations must be taken into account in any examination of the future prospects of the working classes. They do not, however, in any way affect the main conclusion to which we desire to point. This conclusion is that rational and sagacious conduct is the only remedy for extreme poverty, with all its attendant miseries. It may be that, for generations to come, evils will have to be borne by those who have taken no part in their creation. Indeed, it seems impossible for the case to be otherwise, since there are no means of insuring that those who live and act without judgment shall themselves suffer the penalty. But the great truth, which we all seem inclined to disregard, is that human folly is the chief source of human sorrow. And not only do we ignore the existence of this fact, but in many instances we adopt remedies or palliatives that serve to intensify the very evils we desire to reduce. And these are usually classed among the "practical" means of coping with the problem, whilst the enunciation of the plain truths of the case is left as a harmless amusement for men who are looked upon as mere theorists and dreamers.

TRAITS OF THE RUSSIAN PEASANTRY.

ENGLISH readers have had many opportunities lately of studying various aspects of the Russian Government and people. Apart altogether from the interest with which political considerations invest the study of that vast and powerful empire, closer acquaintance with the Slavonic peoples and their institutions awakens our liveliest curiosity and sympathy in many directions. We propose to dip lightly into one of the most recent studies of the Russian peasant by a writer¹ whom we need not introduce to readers of this REVIEW. We all know pretty well what "Stepniak" has to say about Tzars and Nihilists. We are not introduced to any such exalted or compromising society in the present work. The figures on Stepniak's latest canvas are mostly simple peasants. But the Russian peasant is a personage of unique interest. In his social life, his domestic institutions, and his beliefs we recognize a host of survivals of stages of social evolution through which the peoples of Western Europe passed so long ago that few traces of them are recorded in our history. The peasant is also a political and social factor of more importance in Russia than in any other European country. The destinies of the great empire ruled by the Tzar depend in the long run on the peasants, who are not only the overwhelming majority of his subjects, but are also the only class that possess any distinctive national characteristics. Indeed, we might almost say there are no classes in Russia—only the masses.

It has often been asserted, both by Russian and foreign observers, that there is in Russia no living independent force other than the Tzar and the masses. This is the doctrine of the Slavophiles especially, and, though an exaggeration, it contains an important truth: it expresses the comparative weakness of the upper classes.

There is therefore no element of Russian nationality so important to understand as the peasant. Fortunately, he is also by far the most picturesque, and the easiest to study. For he is the same everywhere. He lives and thinks aloud in the open air, in the sight and hearing of all his village. And he has been sketched again and again by great artists who knew him well, and faithfully noted his characteristics. Stepniak is not indeed one of these great artists,

¹ *The Russian Peasantry: their Agrarian Condition, Social Life, and Religion.* By Stepniak, Author of *Russia under the Tzars, Underground Russia, &c.* London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co. 1888.

but he is at least a painstaking and well-informed student, who loves and understands the people for whom he has suffered.

In a former paper (see WESTMINSTER REVIEW, March 1888) we spoke of the breaking-up and gradual disappearance of the old patriarchal family—one of the most important and characteristic of the peasant institutions. The influence of the younger generation of wives, whose position in the “great family” is very irksome, is strongly in favour of this change. But a far more potent influence in the same direction is the economic difficulty arising out of the unequal earnings of different members of the family. Formerly all stayed at home—as serfs they had, of course, no choice—and contributed equally to the maintenance of the family by jointly labouring on the family land. Common property in the produce of their joint labour was natural and convenient. But nowadays the most enterprising members of the family frequently leave home to seek employment elsewhere. Money is more needed than formerly, and at the same time there is less to be made from the land, which is less in extent and inferior in quality. Accordingly, one brother goes to work for a well-to-do neighbour, another leaves his village in winter to work in a distant town. There he earns high wages, which he is bound to send to the common family treasury controlled by the head of the family. But with the weakening of the family sentiment, naturally resulting from long absence and town influences, he soon begins to ask himself why his brothers and sisters at home, who are doing nothing and earning nothing, should enjoy the benefit of his industry and ability. He observes, too, that outside the little world of his village a different principle prevails, and sooner or later he applies it to his own circumstances.

The action of this disintegrating factor in the life of the modern patriarchal family is admirably illustrated by the charming Russian writer, Gleb Uspensky. One of his inimitable tales of village life is translated by Stepniak, and we will endeavour to condense it here for the sake of the glimpses it gives us into the very heart of the Russian village home.

The Gorshkovs were one of the richest and largest peasant families in Slepoe Litvinovo, and had always lived under one roof. At almost any hour of the day all who were not working at the moment might be seen seated round a big *samovar* sipping their weak tea. To strangers they appeared united; but there was a deep-seated internal discord in the family, which in fact was only held together by the skill of the clever and robust old grandmother whom all were accustomed to obey. This discord had been gradually worming itself into the heart of the family ever since the time when the necessity of earning something first became manifest. One of the brothers went to St. Petersburg for the winter months as a cabman, whilst another engaged himself as a forester; but the inequality of their

earnings disturbed the economic harmony of the household. For the cabman had sent the family 100 roubles (£10) in five months, while the forester had only been able to earn 25 roubles in the same time. Now the question which occurred to the cabman was, Why should the forester consume with such avidity the tea and sugar dearly purchased with the cabman's wages? It was still worse that these good things should be so greedily consumed by all the numerous members of the household—the elder brother, for instance, who alone drank something like eighty cups a day (the whole family consumed about 900 cups per diem), which he did not move a finger towards earning. While the cabman was freezing in the cold night-air, or taking care of some drunken fare, or getting abused and beaten by a policeman, this elder brother was comfortably stretched at full-length on the top of the warm family oven, pouring out some nonsense about twenty-seven bears he had seen rambling through the country, with their whelps, in search of new land for settlement. True, the cabman's children were fed in the family while he was away in the town; but he earned their bread by his labour on the land when he came home in the summer. The only thing which made him tolerate his dependency was that the horse and sledge which he drove in town had been purchased out of the common funds. He attempted to "conceal" part of his earnings, but the family found him out. His little daughter earned fifteen roubles for the family by selling wood-berries, and he tried to keep back for himself that amount out of his wages, but the grandmother would not permit it.

The next brother—the forester—began likewise to calculate how much of his wages went to the elder brother and his family. A dress for Paranka, the eldest brother's daughter, had been purchased out of the forester's money. He was greatly vexed about this, and, as the grandmother took Paranka's side, he spent all his next month's wages at the public-house instead of bringing it home.

These disturbing notions of "mine" and "thine" were felt in every trifle—every lump of sugar, every cup of tea, every cotton handkerchief. Nicolas (the cabman) looked at Alexis (the forester), thinking, "You are eating of that which is mine," conscious all the while that he, too, had at times eaten of something belonging to his younger brothers. Alexis, in his turn, was not quite at his ease. It was all very well for him to hiccough freely after drenching himself with as much tea as he could hold, by way of letting it be known that he was well satisfied with himself, and was under no obligation to any one; but he was not sincere. A misgiving lurked in his heart that either in this tea or in that sugar, or in the white bread, or—which was most certain and most humiliating of all—in his own stomach, there was something belonging to somebody else.

They drank their tea solemnly and silently, looking steadily into their cups; but it always seemed as if each was trying to drink as

much as the others, and keeping a sharp look-out lest any one should out-eat or out-drink the rest. It was the same in everything. If you hired horses of one of the brothers to drive into town, the others, on meeting you, would try to find out how much you had paid him. This state of things could not last long. Paranka was the first to break out openly. She took it into her head that she could not do without a regular woollen town-made dress. For a year and a half the men unanimously resisted this whim with unflinching resolution. A million times at least it was proved to them by the grandmother and the other women, the demonstration being generally enforced by Paranka's tears, that no less than 100 roubles of Paranka's money had been spent on the family. The men stood firm: only when the grandmother took to weeping about it did they at last give in.

The eldest brother was accordingly commissioned to inquire about the prices and everything appertaining to the matter. It was decided that he should go to the next port, distant fifteen miles, and make inquiries there. He took a provision of oats and hay for the horses, spent two days on the trip, and, having consulted with the smith, the farrier, and several merchants, returned home not one whit the wiser. By dint of tears, Paranka moved her uncles to try what they could do. Putting horses into the cart, they also made an expedition to the port, but had no more success than the eldest brother. It was soon evident that the women themselves must be sent, for Paranka gave the men no peace with her constant weeping. At last the women were sent; but lo! they returned perfectly horrified. Nobody would think of making a dress such as Paranka wanted for less than 40 roubles (£4). Here all the brothers, their wives, and even Paranka herself, felt that the project was at an end. But God saved Paranka. A soldier who happened to be at the port heard about the inquiries of the Gorshkov women, and sent word to the head-quarters of a cavalry regiment, stationed near Novgorod, some thirty miles off. By a lucky chance, an officer at Novgorod was sending a piano to St. Petersburg. A dressmaker persuaded the carrier to take her along with the piano, and she arrived triumphantly at Paranka's village, seated upon the instrument.

She persuaded the family that all could be well and cheaply arranged. But when the brothers came to count up everything that had been spent on the dressmaker during the six weeks that she stitched and unstitched the dress, they found that it represented a sum equal in value to the framework of two peasants' houses. And after all, the dress was quite unwearable!

The next to squabble was Nicolas, who complained that he had long since redeemed the horse and sledge; but the first to break away and separate in real earnest from the family was Alexis, the forester.

That part of his earnings which he considered to be an extra, he faithfully spent in drink, that it might not fall to anybody's share. He did not, like Nicolas and Paranka, conceal it. But when sober he could not help feeling that at times he ate that which he had not earned. To screw his courage up to break with his family he gave himself up to reckless drinking. He squandered seventy roubles—a whole year's wages—at the public-house, and drank himself mad. By this means he was able to tear himself from his own people. In a sober state he would never have had the heart to take away his children from the paternal roof-tree, to lead away the cow and the horse, or to pull the slits. His example was followed by other members of his family; and in a short time the whole Gorshkov household was broken up.

This little sketch is typical of what is going on in millions of families all over Russia. It illustrates several points both in Russian character and in the new economic position of the peasant. The tenderness of heart which made it impossible for Alexis to do in cold blood the thing he had deliberately determined must be done, is a characteristic Russian trait. Unfortunately, the resort to artificial means of stifling the promptings of his softer nature is equally characteristic of his countrymen. Formerly the produce of the communal land was sufficient to meet the peasants' needs. The family lived almost exclusively on what its own labour won directly from the land. They seldom sold or exchanged any portion of it. Each family was self-sustaining, self-dependent. Money was very little required. But since the emancipation their *economic* position appears to have got worse. They have less land than formerly (the best of the peasant-land having been generally allotted to their late masters), and they have heavy taxes before unknown. More money is needed for payment of these taxes, and at the same time they have less land. According to Stepniak, the "State peasants," who are the best off of the rural population, are obliged to provide about 40 per cent. of their annual expenditure by "outside" work. In fact, over 90 per cent. of the produce of their land goes in taxes; and the former serfs are much worse off, for their taxes actually amount, if Stepniak is right, to double the produce of their land. Hence they are under an imperative necessity of making money by "outside" work—*i.e.*, by hiring their labour to richer neighbours, or going as they now do, in considerable numbers, to work as artisans in the towns. The moment one member of the family takes this step, the temptation arises to sever himself from the family partnership, which is no longer beneficial to him. The spread of railways and means of communication facilitates the migration to the towns in search of wages. The exigencies of commerce and the competition of large factories are driving the peasant artisans out of the villages, just as the same causes have done in England. Terrible is

the struggle they make to meet this competition. A working-day of seventeen hours is common amongst the village weavers, lace-makers, rope-twisters, &c. The mat-makers—an extensive trade—have invented a unique relay system. They sleep three times in the twenty-four hours. By this means they manage to squeeze nineteen hours of work out of themselves. When hard pressed they can manage twenty-one. So says the Report of the Commission of Inquiry. In fact, the growth of town industries fed by the rural population is going on throughout the vast Russian Empire, just as it has done in England and other Western countries, only it has begun later, and is progressing more slowly as yet, Russia having no large foreign market for her manufactures, almost the whole of which are consumed at home. In the face of these new conditions of life ever approximating to the modern economic conditions of Western Europe, it is impossible that the patriarchal family can long hold together. Most Russian writers do not regret its inevitable disappearance. They consider, rightly no doubt, that individual independence is a precious quality which patriarchal institutions tend to destroy.

Tikhomirov, indeed, denounces this primitive institution with passionate vehemence. He declares that “the great family is a veritable school of slavery. A man brought up in its midst will bear without any sense of shame the most bloody despotism of law or of government.” But the closest observer cannot help regretting the general relaxation of social ties between members of the village commune which accompanies the loosening of the family bond, and is due to similar causes.

The struggle for existence, in fact, is becoming far more intense, far more individual. Inevitably the instinct of self-preservation, developing, when the conditions are favourable, into a hard, grasping selfishness, is taking the place of the old easy-going, good-natured co-operation. “Charity—for our people are still very charitable,” writes Stepniak, “is the meagre wraith of the once high conception of co-operative assistance, tendered as a duty on the one hand, and accepted as a right on the other.” The old custom of “collecting morsels,” so well described by Engelhardt, is no longer looked upon with such a kindly eye by those who have anything to give. Probably it is now rare, but it deserves to be noted, for it presents almsgiving in its simplest and most touching aspect. The following account of it is founded on Stepniak’s rendering of Engelhardt:—There is no regular distribution by weight of baked bread to beggars, as is, or rather was, the custom in olden times at the manor-house. The cook simply gives, as all peasants do, “the morsels,” or small pieces of rye-bread, to all who ask for them. As long as a *moujik* has a single loaf left in his house his wife will give “morsels.” Engelhardt gave no orders and knew nothing about the

custom. His cook decided on her own responsibility that "we must give morsels." In his province, even after a good season, few of the peasants were able to make their own bread last until harvest-time came round again. Almost every family had to buy bread to some extent; and when there was no money for it the head of the household would send the children and the old men and women for "morsels." By the end of December about thirty couples used to come every day to Engelhardt's kitchen. There was nothing, literally nothing, to eat at home. Yesterday they eat the last loaf of bread from which the day before they cut morsels for those who knocked at their door. A man who seeks for morsels is not to be confounded with the regular beggar. The latter makes begging his profession. He has no land, no house, no permanent abiding-place. He wanders from place to place, collecting whatever he can get, and converting it as quickly as possible into money. He is generally a cripple, an old man past his work, or a fool. He is clad in rags, and begs clamorously of every one. But he rarely goes among the *moujiks*, and prefers fairs and busy places where merchants and gentlemen congregate. The man who asks for "morsels" is of quite a different class. He is a peasant from the neighbourhood, dressed like all his brother peasants; a linen sack slung over his shoulders is his only distinguishing mark. He enters the house as if by accident, and on no particular business except to warm himself a little; and the mistress of the house, so as not to offend his modesty, will give him the morsel incidentally and "unawares." If he comes at dinner-time he is invited to table. The *moujik* is very delicate in the management of such affairs, because he knows that some day he, too, may perhaps have to seek morsels on his own account. The man who calls for "morsels" would be deeply hurt at being treated as a beggar. On entering a peasant's *izba* he makes the sign of the cross, and stops on the threshold in silence, or mutters in a low voice, "Give in Christ's name." Nobody pays any attention to him; all go on with their business as if nobody were there. Only the mistress approaches the table, picks up a piece of bread three or four square inches in size, and gives it to her visitor. He makes the sign of the cross and goes. If two people come together (they generally work in couples) the mistress puts the question, "Are you collecting together?" If the answer is "Yes," she gives them a piece of six or eight square inches, otherwise she cuts it in two and gives a piece to each. The man who tramps the neighbourhood in this way owns a house, and has his allotted share of the communal land. He possesses horses, cows, sheep, clothes; only for the moment he has no bread. Irretrievable ruin would follow the selling off of his cattle, and he is not expected to do this. When he gets in his harvest he will not only cease begging, but will himself be a giver of bread to others. If by means of the aid now afforded him he weathers the storm and

succeeds in finding work, he will with the money he earns buy bread, and himself help those who have none.

In the autumn, when the crops are just gathered, almost every one enjoys the luxury of pure whole-meal rye-bread. Just a few exceptionally prudent families do add husks to their flour even at this season of the year, but such foresight is rare. When, after a time, the head of the family notices that flour is running short, the family has to begin to eat less—perhaps twice a day instead of three times, then only once. The next step is to add husks to the flour. When the flour is all gone, corn is bought if there is any money left after payment of taxes, or if any can be borrowed at the most exorbitant rate. When all means are exhausted, and the last bread has been eaten, the children and old people swing the sack over their shoulders and tramp to the neighbouring villages asking help. The father may perhaps have the good fortune to procure a few bushels of corn, and in that case the children cease to go begging, and the mistress once more distributes morsels to those who knock. But if the father fails to procure corn, the children are followed in their quest for morsels by the grown-up members of the family, and finally by the father himself, who does not go on foot, but with his cart and horse, his wife remaining alone in the house to look after the cattle. In the winter it is common enough to meet on the country roads a cart full of sacks of “morsels,” and on the cart a *moujik* with perhaps a little boy and a girl. Such a party will not return home for several days or even longer, and will collect a considerable supply of morsels, which they dry in the oven when stopping to sleep in some village. The family feeds on these biscuits, while the father works about the house or seeks employment. When the stock of “morsels” is exhausted, the horse is once more put into the cart, and they go again on their weary rounds.

Such is, or rather was when Engelhardt wrote, the voluntary system of poor relief amongst the peasants in North-West Russia, and a similar custom existed in almost all parts of the empire. More recent observers lament that it is dying out, along with many other customs and sentiments that till lately ennobled the peasant's life, and softened by mutual help and sympathy the hardships of extreme poverty. Stezniak speaks of the “cold-blooded indifference to others' woes, the animal egotism, indicative of a universal breaking up, which has struck with awe many of the observers of modern village life.” The imperative necessity that “the new times” have forced upon every peasant of making money, and making it by methods for which his training and tradition have not prepared him, under penalty of sinking, as millions have sunk and are sinking, into the ruined class of landless peasants—this necessity and this penalty, always dangling before the peasants' eyes, seem to have developed a hard mercenary spirit in their dealings with one another, as novel as it is unlovely.

The religious side of the Russian peasant mind is one of the most puzzling—one of the most important, too, and well worth investigating. It is a hotly disputed point among modern Russian writers whether their people are profoundly religious or quite the reverse. The Slavophiles maintain that they are pre-eminent among the peoples of the earth for their religious character. Kostomarov and other students of popular religions hold exactly the opposite opinion. They are at all events extremely superstitious—"wallowing in superstition," is Stepniak's phrase; and he claims for them that no nation in Christendom has so extensive a demonology, such a perfect survival of their ancestral pagan mythology. The Russian peasant of to-day peoples the woods and streams, not with gods as did his ancestors, but with inferior demons—river-spirits, sylvan-spirits, household-spirits. He believes devoutly in their existence and their frequent interference in his private affairs. He sees them now and then. In Russia, as elsewhere, Christianity could not annihilate the heathen gods and goddesses it found in possession. It only displaced them, drove them out of heaven, and sometimes into hell. Even when the apostles of Christianity had the hardihood to declare that the pagan gods who had reigned for ages undisputed were pure fictions, mere creatures of the imagination, they were listened to with scornful incredulity. That there might be other and more powerful gods than their own was probable enough, just as there might be other and more powerful kings than their own in some other lands. And if missionaries claiming to be the messengers of some such mighty deity could offer proof of his superiority, the people were ready enough to acknowledge his supremacy. But they would continue to believe in the existence and limited powers of the older deities. They would still fear to offend these latter, still dread their resentment, and quite expect to be subject to petty worries and annoyances prompted by the natural spite of the dethroned and dishonoured gods of old. These dethroned powers would thus quite naturally assume in the eyes of the people the character of malignant spirits, waging constant war against them. To appease their wrath, the peasants would offer sacrifices and perform rites in their honour. Practices of this sort, we know, were prevalent in Russia as late as the seventeenth century. Peter the Great tried to put them down by *ukaze*. To this day traces of the worship of heathen gods are found in some of our own country customs—*e.g.*, dancing round the maypole, morris-dancing, and the bonfires on Midsummer-night. But in Russia, we are assured, "thousands of customs and observances of flagrantly pagan origin are faithfully preserved by the people. Fishermen still offer small propitiatory sacrifices to the river-gods, and each family does the same to its household deities. The sorcerer, who is supposed to be the priest of these malignant spirits, is more feared than the *pop*—the accredited minister of the true religion."

The Russians, of all ranks apparently, give evidence of comparatively recent emancipation from paganism in the tendency to fetishism, exhibited in their attitude towards religious rites and ceremonies. The one important thing in their eyes is that the ceremony should be correctly performed by the authorized functionary, but as to the spirit pervading the performance, that is of no consequence at all. A baptism or a blessing, vitiated by the slightest informality, would be regarded as of no effect; whereas, if all the proper forms are carefully observed, it is quite satisfactory, although the officiating priest may be a dissolute, drunken scoundrel, whom as a man they despise and abhor. "Provided the *pop* be the right *pop*, and the words he utters be spoken in the right way and in the right place, they will have their due effect, whatever be the attitude of mind of the speaker or his personal character, and whether he does it for love or for money." After all, it might be urged, is this attitude towards Church ceremonies altogether unknown in Western Churches? Is it not, indeed, a necessary consequence of the belief in the objective efficacy of such ceremonies? If baptism be necessary to save the infant-soul, can we suppose that the child will be damned because the priest was drunk the night before, and intends to be drunk the night after? As a matter of fact, the village *pops* are a very ignorant, drunken, corrupt set of men, openly despised and shunned by the *moujiks*, who none the less set great store by the *pop's* ministrations, and make great pecuniary sacrifices to purchase them. They bargain with a *pop* to perform a marriage or a burial, as we might bargain with a sanitary engineer to set our drains in order, never troubling ourselves about his private character. In both cases the man's competence to do the stipulated job is all that is considered. There may be haggling over the cost in one case as in the other; and by all accounts the *pop* drives a harder bargain than the engineer. In fact, as Stepniak says, "the *pops* are looked upon by their parishioners, not as guides or advisers, but as a class of tradesmen who have wholesale and retail dealings in sacraments." It is only fair to add that the rural *pops* have no endowment, and are dependent on the fees they extract, with considerable trouble, from the impecunious *moujik*. It should also be said that things are slowly improving, and the *pops* of to-day are men of better character than those of a generation back. We could hardly find now a church where "two or three different songs were sung at the same time, or several parts of the Litany read simultaneously, so that nothing could be understood—the congregation talking, laughing, and quarrelling during the service, and coming and going freely, standing with heads covered."

And yet, when this religious indifference was at its height, thousands, nay millions, of Russians were found ready to endure the most

frightful persecution, eager even to grasp the crown of martyrdom, to seek literal baptism by fire, rather than accept the most trifling innovation on their ancient ritual. In the whole history of religious enthusiasm there is no popular movement more incomprehensible at first sight than the *Rascol*—the great religious schism of a portion of the Russian peasantry in the seventeenth century. So far as one can see, this revolt of the peasants against their Church was caused simply by the Patriarch Nikon's determination in 1654 to reform the Missal, so as to bring it into harmony with the Greek mother-church—*e.g.*, by making the sign of the cross with three fingers instead of two, by representing the cross itself with four equal arms instead of three short and one long arm, by spelling the name of "Jesus" as we spell it instead of in the corrupt Russian form "Jsus." These and a few similar matters of even less importance were the only matters of religious doctrine or practice at issue. Apparently it was a clear case of "Tweedledum and Tweedledee." The bulk of the people indeed took this view; but a minority would not have these "innovations" at any price. "It was for these trifles—a letter less in a name; a finger more in a cross; the doubling instead of trebling of a word—that thousands of men and woman encountered death on the scaffold or at the stake. It was for these things that other scores of thousands underwent the horrible torture of the knout, had their bodies mutilated, their tongues cut out, their hands chopped off." Incredible as all this seems, is it not far more incredible that "their opponents, the dominant Church party, comprising all the best educated among the clergy and society, should burn, hang, and decapitate hundreds and thousands of their fellow-creatures, and ruin and devastate entire provinces (of their own country!) for questions so utterly unimportant?" Is it not monstrous that a great Council of the Church, presided over by the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, should solemnly pronounce a frightful curse upon the handful of *pops* and *moujiks* who clung to the forms to which they and their ancestors for generations had been accustomed—"their souls," so runs this blasphemous curse, "in virtue of the power conferred on the Church by Jesus Christ, to be given up to eternal torments, together with the soul of the traitor Judas and the souls of Jews by whom Jesus Christ was crucified"?

The spiritual thunder of the Patriarchs was supported by the lightning blast of the secular power, armed with sword and fire. A war of extermination began; but the *Rascolniks* (Schismatics) only multiplied in numbers, and their zeal grew more intense as the persecution became more inhuman. Thousands perished, but thousands also escaped to the impenetrable forests and marshes, to the frozen shores of the White Sea, to the uninhabited wilds of Siberia. By the order of the Tzar Alexis they were hunted down like wild beasts, and burned alive when caught. But the religious

exaltation of the Rascolniks was more than equal to the fury of the "orthodox." Resignation to martyrdom passed into a yearning for it. Take the following historical incident, one of many similar:—On a small island in the Sea of Ladoga there stood an orthodox monastery—Paleostrovsky—hated by the Rascolniks because its monks used their knowledge of the surrounding country to guide the Tzar's soldiers to the Rascolnik settlements. In 1688, while a party of the fiercest of the orthodox were devastating the Rascolnik settlements in the Onega district, a Rascolnik monk, Ignatius of Solovezsk, conceived the idea of a great holocaust for the glory of the true faith. At the head of a great crowd, armed with bludgeons and axes, he crossed the frozen lake, put to flight the soldiers who guarded Paleostrovsky, drove out the orthodox monks, and took possession of the monastery. In due time the Tzar's troops, a battalion of infantry and guns, arrived from Novgorod, and marched to the assault. The Rascolniks retired to their big wooden church, filled it with combustible material, and when the troops broke into the monastery, shut themselves up, barred the doors and windows, set fire to the building, and perished in the flames. At least 1500 sacrificed themselves on this occasion, but the Rascolnik historians double this number. This event is known as the *first* Paleostrovsky "locking up." The monastery was rebuilt and the orthodox monks restored, but a few years later the Rascolniks were seized with a wild desire to repeat the same act of faith in this stronghold of the Nicovians. They took possession of the monastery a second time, but, far from wishing to hold it, their chief anxiety was to gain time sufficient to allow the inhabitants of the neighbouring villages to join them and share the glory of the "locking up." With sham debates and other devices they managed to delay the assault until some 1500 candidate martyrs had secured places in the church. Then they set fire to it. The soldiers pulled a few of them out of the flames, but those who were thus rescued were overwhelmed with this proof of their exceeding sinfulness, seeing in it the stern refusal of God to accept a sacrifice at their unworthy hands.

Fanaticism might account sufficiently for wild outbursts of this kind, but the temperament which has kept the Rascol movement alive to the present day, through two centuries of persecution and discouragement, deserves a more honoured name. Tikhomirov speaks of it as a protest against the despotism of the rulers of the Church, who attempted to do by their own arbitrary authority that which the whole body of the faithful could alone do. But, whatever the great schism may have been in the beginning, it has undoubtedly developed in many directions the spirit of independent inquiry, and it has compelled the recognition of some approach to liberty of thought in spiritual matters. To-day the Rascolniks and "sectaries" number some fifteen millions. They are less absorbed

than their ancestors in questions of doctrine, and more interested in social questions. The great mass of the population are, as we have said, strangely indifferent to the spiritual element of religion, while they attach the highest importance to its forms. Yet it can hardly be doubted that there is in the Russian peasantry a dormant capacity for intense religious fervour, "an enormous potential force," Stepniak calls it, "which may be awakened some day, and appear as a new and important agent of our national history. Here, in the presence of this latent force, which has never yet been tested, lies perhaps the greatest enigma of Russia's future." The moral and intellectual awakening, which students of Russia assert to be in progress, shows a strong tendency to run into religious channels. In this fact lies, perhaps, one explanation of the political inactivity, the quiet endurance by the masses of the hardships to which they are subjected, and which they make no attempt to combat with political weapons. Stepniak expressly adopts this explanation. "The moral, political, and social discontent, seething in the heart of the rural population of Russia, has found a sort of safety-valve in the new evolution of religious thought, which nowadays covers almost the whole field of the intellectual activity of the Russian labouring classes." It is impossible to foresee when, or with what tremendous results, for good or for ill, the new religious enthusiasm may express itself in political action.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

AT the present moment the Irish question seems to occupy almost exclusively the field of politics, but it is certain that, sooner or later, other matters will come to the front, and very likely even before the country has given its decision between the policies of Home Rule and Coercion. And it is certain that among the most important of these is one which very probably will be involved in the settlement of the Irish question, as it seemed likely to be in that of the franchise—namely, the course to be taken with regard to the House of Lords.

It may safely be assumed that practically all genuine Liberals are resolved that the Upper House shall not indefinitely remain a body of hereditary legislators invested with the power of rejecting any reform desired by the representatives of the people.

In fact, there is a pretty general opinion among Liberals that the obstructive attitude of the Lords has been put up with too long already. For half a century at least they have constituted a most serious obstacle in the way of reforming legislation. They brought the country to the verge of civil war before they would consent to pass the Reform Bill of 1832, and since that time they have not only in many cases delayed the passing of measures which had been approved of by large majorities in the Commons, but have not unfrequently either rejected useful reforms altogether, or have so mutilated them as to render them almost worthless. For twenty-six years the right of Jews to sit in the House of Commons, though that body repeatedly pronounced by large majorities in favour of their admission, was denied by the Upper House. They refused for years to grant to Ireland a reformed system of municipal self-government similar to that which England obtained in 1835, and the measure they were at last induced to pass was so mutilated by them as to be of little value, since it applied only to a few towns, and imposed a very high qualification for the franchise. They have again and again rejected a reform in the marriage law which the Commons have as frequently pronounced in favour of. Many more instances might be cited, but these are sufficient to convict the Lords of being persistent obstacles to reforms demanded by the people through their representatives.

It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that, when they brought their political misdeeds to a climax by rejecting the extension of the franchise to the county householders in 1884, the cry was loudly raised among the more advanced portions of the Liberal party, with reference to the Upper House, "Mend it or end it!" And though the prudent surrender of Lord Salisbury and his followers on this occasion caused the question to drop for the time, yet there is no doubt that it will sooner or later come up again. If, for instance, as is most probable, the next House of Commons contains a majority in favour of Home Rule for Ireland, how is any such measure to be got through the House of Lords? There is little doubt they will reject it the first time it comes up to them, and once more the country will be face to face with the problem—What is to be done with the Peers? The general direction of Liberal opinion, so far as it found expression four years ago, seemed rather to be in favour of mending than ending, but, when proposed schemes for reforming the Upper House come to be discussed in detail, it will be seen that they are all more or less objectionable from a Radical point of view.

Any second Chamber which admitted the hereditary principle as its basis would be almost certain to prove itself as antagonistic to popular measures as the present Upper House, and the only effect of a so-called reform which retained this principle would be to strengthen the aristocratic element in our parliamentary Constitution, and render it a more effective obstacle to democratic legislation, which of course no Radical would desire. And even if we suppose the present constitution of the House of Lords to be entirely abandoned, and some new kind of second Chamber be devised like the French Senate, such a Chamber must necessarily, if it is to have any intelligible reason for its existence at all, be a representative of class interests, assuming for itself the function of checking the actions of the popular House.

Hence, most consistent Radicals who have thought the matter out have come to the conclusion that no second Chamber at all is necessary, and that it would be better to have a Parliament consisting of the House of Commons alone; and this view is strengthened by a consideration of the circumstances of other countries. Hardly anywhere have second Chambers worked well; they have invariably tended to become the embodiment of narrow class feelings, and have come into constant and irritating conflict with the assembly which represents the people. Such has been the case with the French Senate, and with the Legislative Councils which constitute the Upper Houses in our Australian colonies.

The case of the American Senate, which is sometimes appealed to by the advocates of second Chambers, is by no means in point. It is a body which represents the separate sovereignty of the States which compose the American Union, as the House of Representatives

is the body representing the federal nation as a whole. In all federal Constitutions, as Mr. Freeman has well explained, it is necessary to have two such bodies for the perfection of the federal idea, but this is of no applicability to a country like England, or any other consolidated State which is not a federal union like Switzerland or the United States. With us the question is simply whether the work of governing the country in accordance with the people's wishes will be better done by one Chamber or two, and on Liberal principles the decision must be in favour of the former.

But the question then arises: How are the Lords to be persuaded or compelled to vote their own abolition? And this is a difficulty which is not confined to this solution of the problem, but applies with almost equal weight to any scheme for materially altering the constitution of the second Chamber. By what means, it must again be asked, can any such measure be got through the present Upper House? And then again the thought suggests itself: After all, is there any need of either mending or ending, if the desired object could be otherwise attained? For is not what is wanted to ensure the passing of measures of reforming legislation without fear of rejection or mutilation by the Lords? And if it could be rendered certain that they would be obliged to pass any Bill sent up to them by the Commons, there would be no need of any further interference with their constitution.

The Crown had once a veto on legislation even more real than the Lords at present enjoy; but, though it still retains this power in theory, every one knows that it is practically impossible to exercise it. If, then, the veto of the Upper House could be as effectually paralysed, it might, like the Throne, continue to exist as an ornamental part of our Constitution. Are there any means of securing this end? If we refer to history we shall find that there are two ways by which the House of Commons, or a Government enjoying its confidence, can overcome the resistance of the Lords. The method of accomplishing this end which is most generally known is by using the prerogative of the Crown to create new Peers of the same opinions as the majority in the Commons, in order thus to bring the two Houses into harmony. The last occasion on which this power was actually exercised was in Anne's reign, in 1713, when the Queen, by the advice of the Tory Ministry, who were supported by a Tory majority in the Commons, overcame the opposition of the Whig majority in the Lords to the Treaty of Utrecht by creating twelve new Tory peers.

Since then the prerogative has never been put in force in the same way, but a similar measure has on several occasions been talked of, and was very nearly being carried into effect to secure the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832. If the Lords had persisted in their resistance to the Bill, Lord Grey's Ministry had, after some difficulty, obtained a warrant from William IV. for the creation

of a sufficient number of peers to pass the measure through the Upper House.

A little consideration will show that the problem cannot now be solved in this way. The majority in the Lords against any such measures of reform as the Advanced Liberal party demand, and hope soon to see supported by the greater part of the Commons, is now so large that to alter the balance of parties a simply enormous creation would be required, which would nearly double the numbers of the Peers. And even supposing that the consent of the Crown to such an unprecedented exertion of the prerogative were secured, it is highly probable that in a few years the work would have to be done all over again, for it is the natural tendency of newly created peers to pass over to the Conservative party, though previously they may have been regarded as strong Liberals or even Radicals. And the absurdity of supposing that the process of creation could go on indefinitely will be obvious at the first glance. Fancy a House numbering its members, not by hundreds, but by thousands!

Is there no other way, then? it may be asked. The answer is that, though it has now been strangely forgotten, a much simpler and better way exists by which the Commons may overcome the opposition of the Lords, which does not require any appeal to the royal prerogative, but which rests on one of the most ancient rights of the popular Chamber, and one by which they have wrested many privileges from the Crown—namely, the power of the purse.

Every one, it may be presumed, is aware that the Commons have the exclusive right of originating Money Bills, and that such Bills cannot be amended by the Lords; they can only reject them, which they have never ventured to do for hundreds of years, as it would leave the country without a revenue. Now, the Commons have full power to give any form to legislation that they please: they may include in one Act several measures which have no natural connection; and this is, in fact, very frequently done when several expiring laws are continued by one Bill, though they may have nothing to do with each other. It is obvious, then, that there is nothing to prevent the Commons from including in a Money Bill any other measure they may wish to pass, and such a Bill the Lords cannot amend; they must accept it or reject it as it stands.

It will be manifest how powerful a weapon is thus put into the hands of the representatives of the people; and one is surprised to find that it is never mentioned in recent discussions on the subject, especially as it has been employed at a past period of our history. The time at which the process of uniting, or, as it was called, "tacking" other measures to Money Bills was practised by the Commons is confined to a particular epoch—namely, to the reigns of William III. and Anne, but then it became for a brief period quite a familiar occurrence.

The Commons had vindicated their power as against the Crown by the Revolution of 1688, and they were by no means disposed to submit to the rejection of their measures by the Lords; hence, on several occasions when the Lords threw out a Bill passed by the Commons a demand was made by some members of the latter House to tack the rejected Bill to a Money Bill, and send it up again.

It is true that this was felt to be a somewhat extreme measure, and hence, though it was often talked of, it was but seldom that a majority in the Commons was found actually determined on taking such a step. Still, there was one remarkable occasion in William the Third's reign on which the process was really put in force to pass measures of such a sweeping character that it is certain that the Lords, neither at that time nor for ages after, would have been induced to accept them unless under positive compulsion. The question which was then at issue arose out of the extensive grant of confiscated property in Ireland which had been made by the King to his favourites. These had been made on so large a scale that they aroused considerable discontent in England, and it was most reasonably contended that land which, by the suppression of the Irish Rebellion, had become the property of the Crown—that is, of the nation—ought not to have been so freely disposed of without the consent of Parliament. Accordingly, in 1699 the Commons appended to the Bill for the Land Tax a clause appointing seven commissioners to inquire into the mode in which the forfeited Irish lands had been granted out. The Lords greatly disliked the proposal, which, in fact, struck at the interests of their own order, as many of them had profited by the King's grants. There is no doubt that they would at once have rejected the proposed appointment of the commission if it had been sent up to them by itself, but, as it was attached to a Money Bill, they were compelled to give way.

When, however, the commissioners presented their Report in the next session of Parliament, in 1700, a great constitutional struggle took place. The Report was no doubt exaggerated in some details; but in the main it was correct in asserting that the scale on which grants had been made was most reprehensible, a tract of country as large as Yorkshire having been divided among three foreign favourites of the King. The commissioners further affirmed, and with reason, that if these grants had not been made, and the land had remained the property of the nation, much heavy taxation might have been avoided. On their recommendation, accordingly, a Bill was introduced annulling the grants, and vesting the forfeited lands in the hands of trustees, who were to administer them for the national good. As it was certain that the House of Lords would not otherwise look at such a measure for a moment, it was again tacked on to the Land Tax Bill.

The indignation of the Upper House was so great that they resorted

to the desperate expedient of striking out the clause for resuming the grants, and sending the measure back thus amended to the Commons. The Lower House, however, stood firm, and were backed by the enthusiastic support of the country. They told the Lords that they had no right to amend a Money Bill; that the point was so well established that argument was needless; and that on the shoulders of the Peers must rest the responsibility of leaving the country without supplies. The feeling of the Commons rose to a high pitch, and threats which cannot be defended, though they were not unnatural, were uttered against the Lords. One member even spoke as follows: "They object to tacking, do they? Let them take care they do not provoke us to tack in earnest. How would they like to have Bills of Supply with Bills of Attainder tacked to them?" In fact, it is highly probable that, had the Lords persisted in their resistance, the next measure sent up to them attached to a Money Bill might have been a Bill for their own abolition, for both the Commons and the country were fully determined to submit to no dictation from the Peers against the vindication of the national rights over Crown lands. The Lords, however, were wise in their generation; they saw that the Commons had the country with them, and accordingly they gave way, and passed the Bill when the Commons sent it up to them again.

The whole history of this crisis is most important in its lessons for our own time. It shows us that two hundred years ago the Commons could, if determined, force the Lords to submit to their will, and it shows them so acting in support of a great Radical principle, which has as yet far from met with complete recognition in legislation—the rights of the nation over landed property. What could be done then can surely be done now when the constitution of the Commons rests on a so much more democratic basis than in 1700. The majority in the Commons on this occasion, though the principle they asserted was, as we have seen, essentially Radical and democratic, belonged to the Tory party, but many of the more popular section of the Whigs were joined with them.

Unfortunately, however, the next measure which it was endeavoured to force through the Lords by means of tacking was a reactionary Bill supported by the most narrow and bigoted section of the Tories. This was the Occasional Conformity Bill, introduced in Anne's reign to prevent Dissenters from taking the Sacrament in church as a qualification for office, and afterwards attending their own chapels. The Lords, in which the Whigs had a majority, several times rejected this Bill, on which the extreme Tories in the Commons proposed to send it up again attached to a Money Bill. Though, however, there was a Tory majority in the Commons in favour of the Bill, yet the "Tackers," as they were called, were not supported by the whole party, and the proposal to tack the measure to a Money Bill was never passed by the Commons, the consent of the Lords being ultimately secured by other means.

This was the last occasion on which any attempt was made to force measures through the Lords by the process of tacking. It had become odious in the eyes of the Whig or Liberal party from the attempted employment of it to pass an intolerant and persecuting Bill, and it soon dropped out of the programme of the Tories, as the exceptional circumstances which for a short time had rendered the Lords more liberal-minded than the Commons ceased to exist.

The very existence of such a power in the hands of the Lower House seems to have been forgotten in later conflicts between the two Houses. It is rather extraordinary that, in the midst of the struggle which convulsed the country when the Lords rejected the first Reform Bill, no one appears to have thought that there was such a way of compelling them to pass it by attaching it to a Money Bill, although matters had come to such a pitch that people talked of refusing to pay taxes if the Bill were not passed, which was, in fact, adopting the same principle in a more violent form.

The only case in recent history in which there was any approach to the exercise of such a power by the Commons was in the repeal of the paper duty by Mr. Gladstone, which, when sent up to the Lords as a separate Bill, was rejected by them, but which was afterwards passed by including it in the general financial arrangements of the year. This, however, was merely uniting one Money Bill with another; it was not attaching to it a measure of an altogether different description.

In the controversy caused by the Lords' rejection of the Franchise Bill in 1884, though many ways of dealing with their House were proposed, no one seems to have thought of a revival of the ancient power of the Commons to tack any other measure to a Money Bill. However, it is certain that the question of how to overcome the resistance of the Lords to reforming legislation must come to the front as soon as we have a Liberal House of Commons, which there is good reason to hope will be the case after the next General Election. And it may well happen that Liberals and Radicals will turn their attention to the historical events which have been narrated as taking place in 1699-1700, and will think that they furnish a good precedent to follow.

Should the Lords throw out a Home Rule Bill passed by the Commons in obedience to the expressed wish of the country, the Lower House would be fully justified in sending the measure up a second time attached to a Money Bill, which the Upper House would be powerless to amend. The old party name of "Tacker" might well be revived, and become, not, as in Anne's reign, the badge of the extreme Tories, but of extreme, or rather of all good Radicals. It is evident that if the House of Commons once used this power, and showed their determination to employ it whenever the Lords rejected Bills sent up to them, there would soon be an end of ob-

structions to reform from this quarter. It cannot possibly be supposed that the Lords would venture to reject a Money Bill and leave the country without supplies, a course which even in 1700 they did not dare to take. It is thus plain that without any violent or revolutionary measure, and without altering the form of the Constitution at all, the veto of the Lords on legislation could be as completely abolished in practice as that of the Crown has long been.

There would then be no need for any alteration in the constitution of the Upper House. The Peers might, if it so pleased them, go through the form of giving their assent to Bills, in the same way as the Sovereign does, and their House might continue to exist as a dignified survival and ornamental appendage, but practically the country would be governed by a single Chamber, as most Radicals desire. Only it would no doubt be the case that such men of talent and genius as there are among the Lords would no longer care to be members of a legislative body whose powers had become a mere form; and an Act might be passed enabling members of the House of Lords to give up their seats in it, and giving them the right of seeking election to the Commons, which all the most eminent of them would no doubt gladly do, and would easily find constituencies to elect them.

In this way, it may be confidently affirmed, the problem presented by the Upper House would find its most effectual solution, and it may be hoped the Radical party will see good reasons for including in their programme a revival of the old Tory precedent of "tacking."

PAMPERED SPORT AND PHEASANT REARING.¹

THERE is a great deal of nonsense written about sporting matters. Those who are enthusiasts in field sports can see no harm in anything that is done in sport's name, while, on the other hand, some women and sentimentalists have an equally unreasonable repugnance to anything that savours of "the chase," and talk with silly vehemence against all kinds of amusement which have "killing" for their object. Such writers generally play into the hands of their adversaries in the argument. It is not often that you find a pen put to paper by any writer who is not in one of these intemperate classes. There are many men who can write eloquently enough even in praise of pigeon-shooting, while there are others who indite shuddering sentences on the enormities of a "battue," and talk foolishly about "shooting down pheasants like sheep;" and we suspect that the former have become a little too callous in their "sport" to form any adequate idea of the trembling standpoint of the latter, and that the latter are too ignorant of all sporting matters to be useful guides to the ethics of such matters. It is not to be questioned for an instant that there are many cruelties in connection with sport. A perusal of these two excellent volumes of the "Badminton Library"—volumes which are written with discretion and at the same time with an immense fund of experience—leave no doubt on that point. Any one who has seen a bad marksman at work, and who knows how many rabbits are wounded and not killed, or who has heard the cry of a wounded hare, will not doubt that there are cruelties connected with sport. At the same time it is easy to make too much of these. Sport which is the hunting for, the chase after, wild animals under such circumstances as give the animal a fair chance of escape unless the chase is conducted with very considerable skill, is in itself a healthy and natural amusement; but to be healthy and natural we think that all these elements must be combined in the sport. There must be the finding of the game, involving some skill; there must be the killing of the game, also involving skill in the use of a delicate weapon; the animal the object of the chase ought to be, to our

¹ "The Badminton Library." *Shooting*. By Lord Walsingham and Sir Ralph Payne-Gallwey, Bart. In two vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

thinking, a wild animal, and to be an animal which either, when living, is an enemy of man, or, when dead, is useful to man as food.

All men, notwithstanding the great advance since the days when their living depended upon their skill in hunting, have a good deal of the hunting instinct in them still. "The chase," "sport," demands the exercise of the whole man, and that is the condition of greatest happiness to the individual. We all know the languid pleasure of a book. We most of us know what a good wholesome thing it is to walk until one is tired, and then to enjoy the rest which the muscles have earned. We know, too, the intellectual pleasure of the exercise of the mental faculties. But it is only when we can combine all these pleasures in a short transcendent hour that we know what pleasure really is. That, then, is what the sportsman—the real sportsman—attains to. A man who walks after his game has the best kind of walk—a walk with an object.¹ But he must also exercise skill and discretion, and walk warily. And even when the game is found, which involves considerable knowledge of the habits of the animal being sought for, it requires the exercise of considerable skill with the gun to kill the game. All these "exercises" are healthy for the man, and up to this point, whatever the bird may think of it, there is no conscious cruelty upon the part of the sportsman. The fact that it is a fair game, that the chances are not unduly in favour of the sportsman, raises the sport to a level quite above cruelty. We say the same of the sport of the man who follows his game as men do over the heather in the North of Scotland, or of the man who has game driven over his butt as they do in Yorkshire. But we would hesitate to give the same name to pigeon-shooting. There we think the game is *not* a fair one. It is obvious that there is in pigeon-shooting an opportunity for the exercise of great skill; but so there is in felling an ox, and, however necessary the killing of oxen may be, no one would apply the term "sport" to the business of the slaughter-house. But there are, as we shall see, other kinds of killing which, in that they are unfair to the game, do not merit the high name of "sport," and ought, we think, to be condemned by public opinion.

Now, of course, there is no cruelty in killing animals which are to be used for food, if no unnecessary pain is inflicted on the animal. The ox that is killed in the shambles no doubt suffers, and so does the grouse that is brought down in the heather. But in neither the art of the butcher nor that of the sportsman is there any unnecessary suffering given if those arts are rightly practised. A good shot kills his bird. It is the sneaking poacher who takes his bird sitting

¹ We do not propose to raise the nice question of old-fashioned sport as against the modern sport of game-driving. There is much to be said in favour of the modern practice, and what is to be said is well said by the authors of these volumes of the Badminton Library. There are some exceedingly interesting problems in connection with the subject which cannot be adequately dealt with in this place.

that is far more likely to wound than the man who takes it honestly on the wing. To us, then, it seems that there is no *prima facie* objection to sport as such. And whether a man walks after his birds with dogs or has them driven over him, we cannot see that the killing is in any sense unnecessarily cruel. We have, we admit, notwithstanding the arguments in the pages before us, a preference for the former—not on the sentimental ground, that it is quite easy to lie in a butt or behind a hedge and kill what is driven over one, for, as a fact, there is nothing more difficult and nothing so likely to test the capacity of the marksman as a shot at driven game, but because we think that exercise should be one of the elements of sport, that a man ought to have the skill to “find” his game, and that the introduction of beaters has a tendency to render sport more mechanical and to confine the pleasure of it to the mere excellence of marksmanship.

We have said so much to show that we are not, like the writers complained of by the authors of these volumes on *Shooting*, prejudiced against sport or sportsmen. We admit that bad marksmen often wound animals, and that these wounded animals suffer intolerably; but, although we do not lose sight of these things, we do not think these incidental or accidental cruelties are sufficient in number to make a sweeping condemnation of all sport reasonable.

We come now to consider other matters. In most of the observations we have made we have been thinking of the killing of wild animals, real *ferre natura*. We have intentionally left out of consideration all questions as to the rights of landlord and tenant, and other nice political matters, and have been dealing with sport as sport, where none of these considerations comes in. No one, however, can shut his eyes to the fact that sport is in this country threatened, that the Game Laws will not exist a great number of years; and that the axe is already at the root of the tree is proved by the “Hares and Rabbits Act.” Here, however, as we have said, we do not mean to deal with any of these State matters, except to say that, notwithstanding the enormous increase of game in England which has been largely brought about by means of the rearing of tame birds¹—of which we mean to say something—we think the days of sport are numbered in this country, and that it behoves those persons who do not desire to expedite its end to see that sport as it is practised is open to as few objections as possible. We are, we think, on their side when we propose to state some of the objections which exist, in our view, to one kind of sport to which we have ventured to apply the epithet “pampered,” and we can, we think, both from our own experience and from the work before us, justify the epithet. We are not

¹ We find that on an estate in Norfolk of about 10,000 acres there were in 1821 only 39 pheasants killed in the season. On the same estate in 1881, 5363 pheasants were killed in the season, and 1136 of these were killed in one day by eight guns (*Shooting, Field and Court*, p. 209).

foolish enough to talk, as some writers do, of pheasant-shooting as if it were as easy as the shooting of barn-door fowls. It is not by any means easy. To shoot pheasants in a covert requires a very quick eye, a steady hand, and a sudden judgment, which fail all but a man of real nerve and considerable experience. Even when the covert is beaten and the pheasants are driven out, the chances are very much in favour of the bird as against any amateur who talks about shooting them down "like sheep." In these cases the young sportsman fires away—"blazes away," he calls it—until his gun-barrels are almost red hot; but, like some of the wounds mentioned by Homer, all his wounds are given to the "patient air," and he has done no harm to the birds which flew over him. Pheasant-shooting requires a nice art and a considerable amount of experience. We do not wish to underrate the skill of a good covert shot, but we desire to point out here that pheasant-shooting seems to lack several of the elements which are necessary to the definition of genuine sport. First of all, however hard they are to hit, it is only by courtesy that pheasants can be called "wild animals." Indeed, the reared birds, as distinguished from those which are hatched and reared in the woods, are spoken of as "tame birds," and it is only owing to the increase in these that the sport in connection with pheasant-shooting has so wonderfully increased, for the number of birds that are hatched and reared in the woods is comparatively small. It is true that Sir Ralph Payne-Gallwey says, "By the middle or end of November, at which date most shooting parties are formed, so-called tame birds cannot be distinguished from the purely wild ones bred in the woods, which latter they equal in their power of flight if properly driven to the gun, and afford, in consequence, as great an exhibition of skill on the part of the shooter."¹ But that is not quite consistent with what is written by his collaborateur, Lord Walsingham, when he says, "In some places it is the custom to take up all the eggs that can be found, but, where no wild birds are allowed to get off, it is difficult to prevent the shooting from becoming somewhat tame, partly owing to the proportion of weak birds likely to be found among those reared by hand, and partly from the fact that hand-reared birds are apt to have a tendency to tameness."² Now, on these confessions alone we think there is something to be said against this "tame sport," against a sport which requires such art in preventing the "tendency to tameness" in birds, and we find these objections to be incident to the very nature of the sport which depends for its existence, as it is now practised, on the rearing of birds. Pheasants are reared to be shot, are brought up "by the hand" in elaborate nurseries, fed upon a most full and careful dietary, watched and warded from their enemies, stoats, weasels, rats, crows, hawks, jack-daws, and owls, doctored for their diseases, bribed to stay at home,

¹ *Shooting, Field and Court*, p. 4.

² *Ibid.*, *Field and Court*, p. 235.

herded when they want to stray, and then sportsmen delude themselves into the belief that they are shooting "wild animals," and upon the sole ground, as we understand it, that when these birds, with their unfortunate "tendency to tameness," are properly "driven to the guns," they are difficult to hit. Do not these facts of themselves justify us in applying the term "pampered sport" to pheasant-shooting? If not, a very few details will convince most readers.

On most well-conducted estates a certain number of birds are caught in October or later, are taken to the pheasantry, where, having had their wings clipped, they are kept and fed during the winter. The birds that are left in the woods, to be expertly "driven to the guns" when the time comes, have also their table spread for them. You may see in most coverts a covered feeding-place for the pheasants, stacks of wheat or barley, and little water-troughs let into the ground. The birds in the pheasantry are kept until they begin to lay, and lay very much like hens. A pheasant hen may be expected even in the mew to lay as many as twenty-five to thirty eggs. The eggs are taken away as soon as they are laid, and the cocks in the pheasantry have often to be taught not to eat the eggs by a little preparation of cayenne pepper. The eggs are then placed under hens, which can hatch and brood about fifteen to eighteen young pheasants. Turkeys have been tried as foster-mothers for tame birds, but on the whole unsuccessfully. To describe all the minute details of the hatching pens and coops would be tedious. One particular will show the care which must be brought to the hatching of pheasants. The hens ought, in the early morning, to be allowed to have a run in the wet grass that they may damp their breast feathers, which increases the amount of warmth imparted to the eggs in the day's sitting; and when that is impossible, it is not unusual to sprinkle the eggs with tepid water at the time of the morning meal. Of course, where pheasants are reared in any numbers, there must be a large number of these nurses or foster-mothers, and sometimes even these are insufficient to the wants of the pheasant farm, and an incubator has to be had recourse to. The commercial element of the sport begins to appear here. It may have cost the gentleman who rears pheasants a considerable amount of money to rear his birds, to feed his pheasantry-birds, and the like, and if he can recoup himself to some extent by selling he no doubt will. Pheasant eggs are, according to the time of year, sold at something like £4 to £5 a hundred, and a careful breeder will not neglect to get, if possible, a "change of blood" by the exchange of some of his cocks and hens or eggs for the cocks, hens, or eggs of another locality.

We have referred to the cost of rearing pheasants. That is one of the aspects which we desire to bring under the notice of our readers. Lord Walsingham makes some estimates, and calculates that the cost of each pheasant when turned off into the covert will

be about 1s. 7d. from the time of hatching." It is true that his figures are for hatching 1000 pheasants; our own impression is that for a smaller number, at any rate, the cost of each bird up to the time it is induced to take to the woods would be more like 2s. 6d., and it must be remembered that even then the expenses of the rearer are not at an end. It is true the birds are in the coverts, but they still have their two or three meals a day. It is true, too, that these meals are of a simpler character. In their early days pheasants have to be most carefully fed. Hens' eggs become a rarity in a pheasant-rearing neighbourhood, for the young birds have custard, it may be with a slight sprinkling of oatmeal in it, three times a day. However many hens may be kept to lay eggs for the young pheasants' food, it is usual, until the birds are at any rate a month old, to collect hens' eggs from the neighbouring farms, and some keepers continue the "custard" almost as long as the "rearer" will let them have a free hand to purchase eggs. Mr. Carnegie, in his work on *Practical Game Preserving*, gives a table of food for young pheasants "as an example of a course of feeding—not of necessity to be followed exactly," which is too long to reproduce in this place, but seems almost as elaborate as the "diet-tables" one sometimes sees appended to the Reports of public institutions, like asylums or workhouses. Any gentleman who rears pheasants will see, in his accounts, charges for "Braymer, British meal, buckwheat, rapeseed, imperial meal, oats, maize, barley," and the like; and, besides these, pheasants, we are told, ought to have, at certain times, boiled rice, onions, chopped artichoke, bruised hemp, chopped lettuce, groats, dry dough, corn steeped for twelve hours, and green food.¹ So much for the feeding of pheasants. But it must be remembered that the coops must be placed in a field where the young birds can run about and pick up insects, and that, according to some authorities, it will not do to use the same land again and again for that purpose. "Most keepers," we are told, "will be found to advocate a change at least once in every three or four years," and it is probable that after a certain time the insects, such as ants, upon which the pheasants feed may be exterminated in any particular field, and that such a change may be a necessity for those most delicately nurtured birds.

But when we have dealt with the cuisine of the young pheasants, we have not nearly completed the subject of their care and rearing. It is an absolute necessity to make provision for the proper watching and warding of the coops by day and by night. For a considerable period the keeper or night-watchman must watch amongst the young birds in a movable shepherd's house or under some shelter, and must light and feed small fires with the object of scaring the various enemies which are on the keen look-out for his feeble broods. Dogs,

¹ Rabbits boiled and chopped up small also form an excellent food.

foxes, and poachers must be guarded against; and it is sometimes difficult to do so. A poacher who was tried recently in a Western town, having been caught netting a field for rabbits, and having some thirty-four rabbits in his possession at the time he was taken, appealed to the Bench, remarking it was very hard "to be had up for those rabbits when that very night he had been through several of the magistrates' pheasant nurseries and had not touched one of their tame birds." It is not certain whether the appeal was a means of procuring leniency. But, besides these, vermin of all kinds must be guarded against. Rats must be poisoned, kestrels and sparrow-hawks shot. The barn-owl, too, must be guarded against. In fact, pheasant flesh is heir to a great number of ills, and it takes a capable and alert keeper to ward them off. Besides these, there are the more insidious beasts of prey. The gape-worm must be guarded against, and treated, when it appears, "without handling the young birds," as the advertisements of the patent medicine say.

With all this care let us suppose that the birds have grown, that they are strong and healthy, although they show a strong tendency to run like ostriches instead of taking to the wing. Now they must be induced to become wild; their natural tendency to tameness must be got over. The coops are gradually taken farther from the keeper's cottage and nearer to the woods, until at last they are actually inside the covert, and the birds are to be seen in dozens about the gateway through which the coops have been taken. Now they are becoming wild birds. Well, even now the imagination has to help us to the idea that these birds have got over their "tendency to tameness." It is well, if we would keep our illusion, to avoid seeing them follow the keeper with his sack of Indian corn, night and morning, or seeing them swarm about his feet. It is a pretty sight, as we have seen it, in a green glade or ride of a branching wood, with the red evening sunlight filtering through the leaves and shining on the beautiful plumage of the old cocks—for these also come at the whistle of the keeper, and eat sometimes until they seem to be on the point of choking. Exceedingly pretty—but it is, to our mind, a pampering of sport to rear your tame birds to be wild, to feed them, watch them, and ward them, and then, when the time comes, skilfully to drive them to the guns of the seven or eight crack shots that are collected for the purpose of your "big day."

Again, we say that it is not upon the ordinary grounds which are animadverted upon by Sir Ralph Payne-Gallwey that we are objecting to the sport. He has, in the Introduction to these two useful volumes, fully exposed the foolishness of much of the writing in so-called "sporting papers" and elsewhere as to sport. We do not for an instant say that a pheasant, except just when it rises, is an easy bird to hit; we have seen too many misses to make such an assertion. Our objection is that all this preparation of the game,

all this elaborate nursery work of rearing of tame birds and dubbing them "wild" by courtesy, is not, in our opinion, compatible with the real fundamental notion of sport. Too much time and money are spent in rearing the bird for the sport that is obtained, and in the end, as we shall see, there is a great difficulty to get over the birds' "tendency to tameness," which must take away from the pleasure of a real sportsman, and degrade pheasant-shooting below the level of real sport. We ourselves do not think the end is so great as to justify the six months' means. We have mentioned the fact that tame birds must be protected from poachers. The ease with which they can be taken is a great inducement to the dishonest; and to prevent theft, as we have seen, constant watchfulness on the part of the keepers is necessary. But there is a kind of theft among the rearers of pheasants which is another illustration of the silliness of this elaborate sport. Pheasants in September are apt to stray, and they are often bribed to do so. You will often hear a keeper say, "Mr. B.'s keeper is feeding against me." And so rival keepers have to bid higher and higher in the way of food to induce the birds to remain in their own coverts, or it may be to induce them to leave their neighbours'. Pheasants, too, are fond of apples—although we have not found these mentioned in the many pheasants' dietables—and will find their way considerable distances to orchards. After the feeding-time, of an evening, you may see great numbers of birds running along the hedge-rows, and finding their way to some orchard, where they will roost. If the villagers who may live near the orchards are aware of the fact, you may easily lose some of your birds, for a roosting pheasant is an easy prey. It is necessary, therefore, upon occasion to herd the pheasants away from such orchards, or from fields which are too near the village. But there are more recondite methods of checking the "wild" tendencies of the pheasants. There are half a dozen mixtures invented which keepers put in the water of the birds, or rub into their Indian corn, with the intention of preventing them from straying. These patent medicines for erraticism are called "Stay at Home" or "Never-Stray" and the like, and some of them have a considerable reputation with certain keepers. It will be seen, therefore, that the rearer of pheasants has a difficult problem set before him. He has to train tame birds, and get them into the woods where the birds are to play the part of wild birds; he must, in the first instance, induce the birds to conquer the "tendency to tameness" which their birth and breeding have instilled into their feathered heads; and, at the same time, he must counteract the birds' tendency to stray or to become too wild, by pampering them with food and medicated water, and herding them when necessary. It is a difficult problem to solve practically, and even when it is successfully solved it does not do much credit to any one concerned. But is all this fitness in rearing a natural preparation to sport? We have

travelled a long way from the savage pleasure of tracking, finding, and killing game to the rearing, fattening, herding, and shooting of "tame birds."

But the sport itself is, to our minds, open to some objections. Many pastimes are apt, in a civilized society, to change their form, and that very often not for the better. Cricket is a magnificent game, and is probably played to-day better than it ever was before. But it is a good deal less of a game, and more of a profession, in these days, when matches are played for the gate-money they yield. It is the same with billiards. Probably no time has produced players at all comparable to Roberts junior, Peall, Mitchell, and some others. But it is a profession of display all through the winter, and the door-money must in some cases yield a large income to the players. The "battue," a word which makes sportsmen very angry we see from these volumes of the "Badminton Library," although it is harmless enough, and only means the shooting of birds which are raised or started by "beating," is the modern form of pheasant-shooting. Sportsmen prefer to talk about "shoots," and we have nothing to say against their nomenclature. The fact remains that the whole character of the sport has altered in recent times. It is no longer usual to follow your game; your game is always driven to you. That is especially true of grouse-shooting as practised in Yorkshire, and of partridge-shooting as practised in Norfolk, Cambridge, and Suffolk. With regard to pheasant-shooting, beating is almost a necessity, and the old-fashioned method of shooting them with pointers, spaniels, and setters has become a thing of the past. It is almost amusing to read some of the descriptions, in the old books upon sport, of the sport that is to be had from finding birds in the hedge-rows, or the use of "springing" spaniels, and to compare them with the records of a modern covert shoot. Some writers maintain that the sport in the latter is much greater than in the former; it is certain that the bags are immensely increased, and if "sport" is to be measured by the number of animals killed, as seems too much the vulgar habit of these latter days, there can be no question of the superiority of the "shoot." Fifty years ago a man would be well content if he had a bag of ten pheasants. Now it is not uncommon to hear of a man killing from two to three hundred birds in one of these November or December shoots. The record of Lord Malmesbury's shooting from 1801 to 1840 shows that in that period he only killed 6320 pheasants. That would look a shockingly small number to a modern shot. We see, for instance, that in the estate in Norfolk to which we had occasion to refer before, in 1875, 5069 pheasants were killed in the season, and as many as 1576 in one day. In 1881, on the same estate, 5363 were killed in the season, and 1136 in one day. These figures are eloquent of the change which has been introduced since artificial rearing has so largely increased the quantity of game available for

sport, but they also indicate, we think, that it is not only the rearing, but the sport that is artificial. The tame birds have a way of running, especially from men, and it was thought in the old time that they took to the wing more readily when pursued by dogs. Sometimes, even in these days, clumber spaniels or other dogs are used in addition to the army of beaters who are employed to brush through the coverts and drive everything out before them to the guns which are posted outside. It is wonderful how, even in face of the army of beaters who go through the wood whistling, shouting, beating on the stems of trees with sticks, and making the day hideous with their noises, these birds, with their tendency to tameness, will run, and that is proved by the fact that it is generally at the last bushes in the covert that the "hottest corner" is. Sir Ralph Payne-Gallwey asserts that "it is invariably the object of the host or his head-keeper to send the game as wild, high, and fast over the guns as is possible;"¹ that may be true when the host has got together seven or eight crack shots—and these are the men that are wanted at a modern covert shoot—but the difficulty of getting the birds to take to the wing at all is often very considerable. When the birds do come, no doubt there are some exciting minutes. Each gunner has two guns and a man to load, and even then he may have to shoot until his hand can scarcely hold the hot barrels of his gun. For the time, no doubt, he forgets his long wait by the covert side, he forgets the tedious preparations during the whole spring and summer for these few minutes of excitement, but we cannot. The old beating of the hedges, which people laugh at nowadays, seemed to us to have more sport, although the shots may have been easier than those brilliant days when there are hundreds of birds spread out to be looked at and counted at lunch-time, when the game-cart meets the shooters at various points to relieve the labouring beaters of the birds, and when the cart is driven off to the nearest station and the birds are sent by train to some poulterer or game-dealer in a large town. It is an exceedingly dear amusement, as may be gathered from what has been said, but that is not, in our opinion, a serious objection to it. It is a dear amusement to purchase great pictures, but we would not limit that luxury by law, because the purchase of pictures is not merely an ostentation in the man who buys, but is an encouragement of art amongst artists. But pheasant-shooting and the rearing which goes before the two or three days—"big days"—when the coverts are shot, costs much money, occupies the time of a considerable number of men, and, so far as we can see, does no particular good to any one. We cannot agree with the writer, quoted with approval by Sir Ralph Payne-Gallwey, who says:

"Pheasant-shooting affords a day's outing and pay to a number of labourers [as beaters], who immensely enjoy it, and it gives employment to

¹ *Shooting*, vol. i. p. 3.

a large number of keepers. It provides thousands of middle-class people with pheasants at the price of chickens, or even less. For instance, during November 1885 any number of fine cock pheasants could be bought in the London market at two shillings apiece, where, if there had been no big days of pheasant-shooting, pheasants would be a guinea a brace. It affords a subject of sarcasm for cockney artists and writers of leading articles in the 'sporting' papers. In short, there is scarcely a class in the community which is not benefited or amused by it."

This seems to us almost sentence by sentence open to contradiction. Some of the statements may be true, but the conclusions that are drawn from them are erroneous. First, the employment of the labourers as beaters, even if they enjoy it, is not a good occupation for them. There are no men worse workers than men who are connected with sport. It is true, pheasant-rearing involves the employment of a number of men as keepers who might be doing work much more useful to the community. It is possible that the market may be glutted with pheasants at two shillings apiece which have cost twice that amount of money to bring to the gun; but we question whether there is any benefit to a community from such gluts. The other statements do not call for answer.

We have endeavoured to avoid the "sarcasm" which the writer complains of, and to state our objections to a "sport" which requires such elaborate preparations—the long rearing and feeding of the game, the tameness of the birds, their unwillingness to take wing. All these are circumstances which seem to us to make it doubtful whether pheasant-shooting ought to be looked upon as a real sport. It is upon these at any rate intelligible grounds that we look upon this "pampered sport" with disfavour.

INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND POLITICAL ECONOMY.¹

POLITICAL economists of the so-called "English" or "orthodox" school are accustomed to treat the world they deal with as purely abstract and ideal. Starting from a few simple principles they arrive at conclusions which hold good only of economic men, and are not intended to be applied to the concrete world of producers, exchangers, and consumers, without very considerable modification by considerations extraneous to the economic sphere. Scientifically, of course, the procedure is legitimate; but the abstractions, taken as they are from existing economic relations, become inadequate when those relations undergo alteration; and the ideal world, abstract though it be contemplated by the abstract science of political economy, has to admit new elements and new relations suggested by the new phase of the phenomena. Thus, every great addition to the doctrines of political economy has been prompted by some new economic situation, and has been constructed either in order to justify an actual policy or to fit circumstances previously unforeseen. Take the mercantile theory in its crudest form. It was constructed primarily to justify the policy of that Government which was at the same time the largest holder of specie and the most deeply committed to a policy of conquest. Take, again, the Protectionist system as devised by Colbert and appended to the mercantile theory. It was justified mainly on grounds of foreign policy, partly as a temporary expedient for establishing industries which would in the long run be able to stand alone and would greatly increase the wealth and power of the country which possessed them. Take the *laissez-faire* principle of the Physiocrats: it was generated, as the historians of the science will tell us, by the reaction against Colbertism, consequent on the financial crisis produced by Law's Mississippi Scheme, and under the influences of the hindrances to free transit due to the fiscal exigencies of the French monarchy. Adam Smith's great work, abstract as it is in parts, and historical as it is in other parts, is not a mere speculative inquiry, but has one moral running through it—the destruction of the mercantile system; and it may be remarked that his main argument²

¹ Considerable portions of the following article were contained in a paper read at the National Liberal Club Political Economy Dinner, July 11, 1888.

² Book IV. c. i.: the clearest explanation of the mode in which exports pay for

against the most enlightened defenders of that system is much less applicable to its earlier history—when international trade, such as it was, must have been largely barter of goods for specie—than to his own time, when that trade had become barter of goods for goods. His attack, in short, owes its force in a great degree to change of economic conditions. Adam Smith and his predecessors no doubt explicitly stated that Political Economy gave practical rules of financial policy; but even when the science becomes more distinctly theoretic the same dependence on the actual situation is observable. Ricardo, generally taken as the type *par excellence* of the abstract deductive political economist, believed himself to be dealing with the actual and concrete; he constructed his theory as a business man on the assumption that all men are business men in almost all their actions; and his theory of rent, ordinarily regarded as purely abstract, is closely connected, as has often been pointed out, with that rise and fall of the margin of cultivation which was the consequence of the fluctuations of the price of corn during and after the French wars. Again, it was only when the *laissez-faire* and free-contract doctrines were seen to be inapplicable to the case of labour in their entirety, that the doctrines were formulated that “the rate of profit depends not on wages but on the cost of labour,” and that trades unions were justified as a legitimate means of securing the due “higgling of the market” between employers and employed. In short, whatever may be the claims of Political Economy to be regarded as an abstract science, great additions to its doctrines seem always due to the presence of new economic conditions.

In the migrations of the present day we have to deal with phenomena without parallel in economic history. There are, first, the obvious and familiar cases: the Chinese in Australia and America; the Russian and Polish Jews in England; and, even more recently, the Italian movement into the United States. The Chinese immigrations have led to violations of international law, which have only been suggested in the Russian case. In British Columbia, as in the United States, the apprehended dangers have led the Colonial Legislature, the Californian Legislature, and the United States Congress to exceed their constitutional powers; while that into Australia has not only led to hurried legislation, the legitimacy of which is at least doubtful, but has actually suggested the imposition of special disabilities on such Chinese as may be British subjects.¹ The migrations from Europe into the United States have led to special legislation—not perhaps unjustifiable—with regard to the importation of labourers under contract; which, however, it has been found quite possible to evade.² In England we have had a

¹ Renter's Telegram, *Times*, June 15. The Colonial Conference suggests that the Imperial Government shall induce the Governments of Hong Kong, the Straits Settlements, and Labuan to prohibit Chinese emigration thence to Australia.

² The “Knights of Labour” in the United States are reported to support a Bill

scare, and an Immigration Committee, both of which have been imitated in the United States. As new countries get filled up, the question of restricting immigration becomes a pressing one. Our own colonies have long objected to the assisted immigration of English labour; and there are Americans who talk of raising the poll-tax of fifty cents per immigrant now collected from the steamship companies to twenty-five dollars, in order, as they say, to prevent their own labour market being glutted by the pauper labour of Europe. In Eastern Europe, strange to say, a somewhat similar grievance is felt, though the immigration there is of a very different class. The immigration into Russia exceeded the emigration, in 1884-85, by no less than $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.;¹ this is mainly composed of German and Austrian agriculturists, and had resulted in 1883 in the permanent settlement of Germans in Volhynia alone to the number of 100,000—a phenomenon which is held by some nationalist Russian writers to threaten the very existence of the village community.² And we have such minor phenomena as the large migrations of Belgians and Germans into France, which go far to compensate for the slow rate of increase of the native population; and also the annual efflux of Italians into Switzerland and Southern France, with which travellers are familiar. There is a very large migration, too—not altogether permanent settlers—from Spain and Southern Europe to South America; though from various causes the supply of this labour seems as yet not to have exceeded the demand. The same may be said of the coolie traffic to Demerara and elsewhere.

All over the world, then, we have movements of population on a scale never heard of before. Now the older political economists obviously never dreamt of this state of things. Adam Smith, indeed, attacks "the policy of Europe" for restricting the free migration of labour within the boundaries of various countries by laws of settlement, corporation laws, and statutes of apprenticeship; but he also notes the great difference in the wages, even of unskilled labour, in contiguous districts, and remarks that "a man is of all kinds of baggage the most difficult to transport." And it could hardly be expected that the writer who declared that, "to expect that the freedom of trade should be entirely restored in Great Britain is as absurd as to expect that an Oceana or Utopia should ever be established in it,"³ would ever contemplate such a much greater change as the international freedom of movement of producing agents. The accepted theory of international trade, dating from Ricardo, involves—in

now before Congress for the appointment of consular agents in Europe to investigate the circumstances of intending emigrants.

¹ *Annuaire Statistique de la Russie*, 1884-1885. Supplement.

² *Russische Revue*, vol. xxiii. (1883), p. 361, *seqq.*: an article by J. Matthæi on Foreign Immigration into Russia.

³ *Wealth of Nations*, iv. c. 2.

Professor Cairnes' words¹—on the assumption, usually made in treatises of political economy, that, as between occupations and localities in the same country, the freedom of movement of capital and labour is perfect, while, as between nations, capital and labour move with difficulty or not at all. Ricardo himself expressly approves this immobility (referring especially to capital), though obviously on non-economic grounds.² Mill³ accepts the assumption, with some reservation as to capital; and, though Cairnes⁴ adopts it, only with considerable qualifications, he does not think the amount of migration so great as to modify the theory of international trade to any appreciable extent; and labour he regards as far less mobile than capital. Such migration (of Chinese and Polynesians) as he notices⁵ only forms new non-competing groups; and, except in this allusion, there seems no reference, in his chapter on "International Trade and the Rate of Wages," to the phenomenon with which we are now familiar in the East End—an export trade due mainly to the presence of cheap foreign labour. Fawcett, indeed, explicitly approved of free migration of labour, so far as economic grounds alone are considered; and puts exclusion of foreign labour (except where social and moral reasons are operative) on a par with other forms of Protectionism.⁶ All such measures, he says, are "unjustifiable," because they inflict an unfair burden on the consumer. And Mr. Sidgwick recognizes the occurrence of international migration of labour as an occasional phenomenon; but he bases his criticism of Mill's theory of international trade on a wholly different point—Mill's alleged neglect of cost of carriage. While Mr. Cliffe Leslie⁷ argued that Mill's principle that reciprocal demand governs international values is not true of all such values, and is true as regards the exchanges between other non-competing groups besides natives. To this Professor Cairnes has answered by anticipation, and Professor Bastable explicitly,⁸ that, though the distinction between international and domestic trade is not absolute, still it is sufficiently marked to justify the retention of the current distinction.

The orthodox political economy, then, makes no provision for the case of international migration of labour.⁹ If it contemplated unrestricted migration the whole theory of international trade would disappear. It is a consequence of that theory, paradoxical, no doubt,

¹ Cairnes, *Leading Principles of Political Economy*, p. 302. Cf. Bastable, *International Trade*, p. 4 *seqq.*

² Ricardo, *Principles of Political Economy*, c. 7 (ed. 1846, p. 77).

³ Mill, *Political Economy*, iii. 17, § 3.

⁴ Cairnes, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 329.

⁶ Fawcett, *Free Trade and Protection*, 1878, p. 16; Sidgwick, *Principles of Political Economy*, pp. 214–230.

⁷ *Fortnightly*, vol. xxv.

⁸ Cairnes, p. 303; Bastable, p. 9 *seqq.*

⁹ Mr. J. H. Levy has pointed out to the author a passage in Destutt de Tracy, (*Traité de l'Economie Politique ni Idéologie*, Works, Paris, 1826, vol. v. p. 211), suggesting that Governments should prohibit immigration, because it increases the suffering caused by the pressure of population. This (noticed also by J. Garnier) seems the only exception to the general neglect of the question in standard economic literature.

but demonstrable, and (what is more) not infrequently realized in practice—that countries may with advantage import what they could produce with less labour and abstinence at home, than are actually expended on their production in the producing country. Australia, to cite Professor Cairnes' instance, imported pit-props from Norway and butter from Ireland during the years of the gold fever, though she had a distinct advantage over those countries in power of producing those articles; because it was more to her advantage to put her labour and capital into the production of gold, and to buy those articles with gold, than to produce them at home. But were labour and capital perfectly free to move, they would at once rush to the country which offered the most favourable conditions of production; and countries with no particular advantages would speedily become entirely depopulated. Mill had recognized this depopulation as theoretically possible; but both he and Professor Bastable treat it as chimerical,¹ and no doubt it is so. But in proportion as we approach to it we shall have to abandon the accepted theory of international trade; and the existence of that theory shows how very little the apprehensions now felt as to the international movement of labour and capital were contemplated even by recent economists.

It will not, however, be difficult to discover how the masters of political economy would have regarded—from the purely economic point of view—any proposal to restrict the free movement of labour. They have frequently been charged with a total neglect of the actual losses and sufferings that arise from the displacement of labour within any country, and it has usually been considered a fair answer to say that they were examining general tendencies in an ideal world, and were entitled to make abstraction of those counteracting causes which occur in the real world, because their influence is comparatively small. But when they came to international trade, the exceptional causes were so considerable as to nullify those tendencies of capital and labour to the most profitable employments which are seen in domestic trade, and so to necessitate a new theory. Suppose, however, they had been convinced that the influence of these exceptional causes tended to decline or vanish, they could only have accepted the fact, and modified their theory accordingly. Values in international trade, as in domestic, would then tend to be determined by relative cost of production under the least favourable conditions (except of course between non-competing groups), and unrestricted migration would result in greater specialization of labour under the most favourable conditions of production, cheaper and more abundant products, and so—what is most important to the great mass of mankind—an increase of the real reward of labour. The temporary inconveniences attending displacement of labour by the newcomers, these economists would have either ignored altogether, or treated as

¹ Mill, *Political Economy*, iii, § 17, 3, *sub fn.*; Bastable, p. 163.

merely incidental; and though (like Ricardo) they might have preferred fixity of capital and labour on non-economic grounds, probably the abstractness of their theory, and the eighteenth-century influences which more or less affected them all, would very probably have prevented their doing so. Indeed, it is precisely the neglect of questions of nationality, patriotic feeling, and the like, which has been made a ground of complaint against the "orthodox," or "English" school, by the followers of Friedrich List in Germany, just as it often is by Fair Traders at home. Of course the answer is that such considerations are non-economic.¹ Non-economic considerations (though not these in particular) have, of course, been most distinctly recognized by English economists, at any rate from Mill onward, as largely modifying the practical applications of economic theory. But there seems no escape from the conclusion that, so far as purely economic grounds are concerned, "the English school" is compelled to extend its approval of free movement of goods to free movement of labour; and that Fawcett has distinctly done so.

It may, however, be said that there are other doctrines of political economy which may serve as a basis for argument against free international movement of labour. The case, it has been suggested, might be met by an extension of the principles of trades unionism.¹ But surely the only part of those principles that an economist can regard as legitimate is that workmen may combine to insure definite agreements and to obtain fair terms in that "higgling of the market" which determines the wage actually paid. But if workmen combine against cheaper labour simply because it is cheaper, they at once become monopolists, and as such are odious to the orthodox economist. Such action is explicitly condemned by Fawcett (as I have shown), by Cairnes, less clearly by Mill, and implicitly by Professor Marshall;² but there is perhaps one ground on which it may be justified, as will be seen presently. One case of immigration is indeed covered by the trades union doctrine: the importation of labourers under contract. For such importation obviously tends to place the native workmen at a disadvantage in making their bargain, since the imported labourers cannot but be ignorant of the precise conditions of the labour market in their adopted country, and when they learn those conditions they are prevented by the terms of their contract from securing a fair revision of their bargain. It is only fair to prevent such contracts by law, as is done (not altogether successfully) in the United States; but not because the labour imported is cheap, but because it is dealt with under conditions which make its fair treatment improbable. The argument for such prevention in short is alien to the arguments against the trade system.

But there is another principle—just now referred to—on which

¹ The author is indebted for the suggestion to Mr. J. H. Levy.

² Cairnes, *op. cit.*; Mill, v. 10, § 5; Marshall, *Economics of Industry*, p. 208.

an economic argument for restriction of immigration might conceivably be based. We have all heard a good deal about it of late years in connection with wages disputes, Factory Acts, and the eight hours movement. It is that the cost of labour is not measurable simply by the rate of wages paid. Lower wages permanently, say by the introduction of Chinese, and it does not follow that in the long run you really lower cost of production—at any rate, cost of production of goods in general. “The American workman,” says a Californian writer,¹ “can of course compete with the Chinaman, but only by lowering himself to the same level; in particular, he must dispense with family life. Now this is not purely a moral or social consideration; but an economic consideration as well. The European or American artisan who works for the wages of a Chinaman will probably sink as a producer even below the level of the Chinaman; he will become, not perhaps incapable of doing what the Chinaman does, but incapable of adapting himself to those new and ever-changing developments of skilled labour which are so marked a feature in manufacturing industry. General loss of versatility and of productive power would be a heavy price to pay for the cheapening of existing goods. If such competition should ever take place in fact, and if the results apprehended should follow, the economist will assuredly have something to say in favour of restriction simply as an economist. Observers testify that the worst paid among our unskilled labourers do extraordinarily bad work; and that their pay, which seems cruelly little, about represents the economic value of their labour; while the only argument for shorter hours of work that an economist can admit is that the productive power of the labourer will be improved in a degree which will more than compensate for the loss of working time. Permanent restrictions on immigration can, it would seem, be economically justified only on the ground that lower wages make less efficient labour. Temporary restrictions are, of course, not the business of the economist.

But is it true, it may be asked, that such a decline would really occur? Such evidence as is furnished by some conspicuous cases at present goes to show that it would, *if*—but this is a very important “*if*”—the competition of the immigrants were really permanently effective against the native in most trades. The Chinese in Australia, and the Poles and Russians at the East End, would seem, where they continue doing the same class of work as the native workman, to do it very much worse. In the furniture trade in Australia, we are told,² it is only the cheapest furniture that they make; in the clothing trade in the East End, the incomers seem to

¹ Mr. G. B. Densmore (?), *The Chinese in California*, San Francisco, 1886.

² See letter in the *Times* from “Colonist,” May 19, 1888. However, Mr. D. Gillies, Premier of Victoria, in despatch to Lord Salisbury, of April 11, 1888, states that their competition has been severely felt in several branches of industry. But which?

take the lower grades of work, where they do not (as they generally do) monopolize a special branch, such as slop-coats and uniforms. But it seems pretty clear that they have not yet permanently affected the better class of workers—in the “bespoke” clothing and boot trade for instance. Why then, the older economists would have asked, can they live and thrive? Why is not the rubbish that they produce driven out by a somewhat better article produced by the native workman, who, being a better workman, can produce it relatively cheaper, even though the wages are higher? For the consumer in orthodox political economy is always supposed to be the best judge of his own interest. In real life, however, not only is the consumer frequently a very stupid person, but—and this is an important point—the “demand” in modern trade is not necessarily a consumer’s demand at all. Many consumers are not free agents. Workhouse children, officials with uniform found by their employers, soldiers, and the like must take what their superiors will give them. The demander is not here the actual consumer, and his interest is not obviously—though it may be really—to get an article of good quality. Again, the purchaser of ready-made clothing in the up-country store in some remote colony will buy low-priced boots and slop-clothing, not because he wants that kind of article, but because the previous demander—the retailer, or the wholesale dealer behind him—has bought the goods on advantageous terms, through the pushing traveller, it may be, of some export house; and the customer must take that article or nothing. The object of the trade need not be to suit the wants of the colonial consumer; it may be to produce something that will be taken by the colonial dealer; and the latter need not by any means be so controlled by the consumer—even if that consumer is fairly intelligent—as to meet his views in the matter of quality. And it may very well be (as Professor Marshall has remarked) the object of a wholesale dealer to sell bad articles rapidly rather than good ones slowly, because quick turnover is more attractive than a remote and laboriously acquired reputation. There is, too, a large home trade in these cheap, worthless goods among the poorer classes, who as consumers assuredly do not know their own interest.

Are we, then, to construct an argument against the free migration of labour on the ground that in the long run such migration may tend to reduce the productive power of the more civilized nations by reducing wages, and with them not only productive power, but the standard of comfort, and with it one of the most important checks to that great bugbear of economists—the tendency of population to outrun the means of subsistence? It is difficult to see from what other part of the orthodox economic theory such an argument can be derived; but the action of wages on productive power has not been sufficiently studied to lead deductively to any very valuable results.

But there are reasons for supposing that the present movements are not of such gravity as to require any special theory whatever: they seem to be abnormal and exceptional.

In the first place, the immigrants appear not to compete with the native labourers, at any rate permanently. We might naturally expect them to form new non-competing groups, to use Professor Cairnes' term, and experience to some extent verifies the prediction. Look at the Chinese in Australia and America. They are laundrymen, gardeners, cigar-makers, slop-tailors, makers of cheap furniture—most of them trades little practised before in those countries, all of them trades which, after the first displacement—and there is evidence that there has been some displacement in the tailoring and shirt-making trades in San Francisco¹—pass into their hands exclusively. It is true that in Australia² they have caused riots by appropriating the best gold-mining claims, and that in California they have been prohibited from fishing in State waters; but there is no evidence, except vague general statements, that they have yet lowered the rate of wages in general, or that the supply of labour in any country they have entered is very likely to be permanently excessive. Temporary want of employment there may frequently be; all new countries are liable to periods of depression, commonly due to reaction after excessive speculation; but a permanently over-stocked labour-market in a new country is below the economic horizon. Take, again, the East End case. It is admittedly only a very few industries that have passed into the hands of the immigrants: cigar-making, ostrich-feather cleaning, fur-cape making, the making of slop-coats (but not trousers or waistcoats), bootmaking for export, and only part of that; and such evidence as can be obtained at present indicates that they have developed an export trade in clothes (if not also in boots) which gives additional employment to English skilled labour, and which, but for their immigration, would probably have conferred that benefit on Germany. That trade has been rapidly increasing of late years.³ Great evils no doubt exist in it, but there are more legitimate means of meeting them than checks on immigration.⁴ More goods have been produced, more labour is employed, and we have another article in which to discharge indebtedness for imports—not at all an unimportant consideration in the face of actual or threatened decline in our staple industries. The displacement of labour, which has been produced by immigration, whether in Australia,

¹ See the book attributed to Mr. Densmore, and before quoted.

² *E.g.*, the Lambing Flat Riots, 1861.

³ See Mr. Burnett's well-known *Report*; Mr. D. F. Schloss, *Journal of the Society of Arts*, February 1887, and in *Fortnightly*, December 1886. It is fair to add that Mr. Schloss's conclusions are not accepted by some authorities in the boot trade, but it is stated that the competition is exaggerated.

⁴ As the workers recognize. See report of meeting in Goulston Hall, Whitechapel, addressed by Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Cunningham Graham, and Mrs. Besant, in *Pall Mall Gazette*, June 29 last.

America, or London, cannot be compared in amount with the displacement due to the introduction of new machinery—say, in the last twenty years—to which attention has recently been called by Mr. Edward Atkinson and Sir Lyon Playfair. Applied political economy does not condemn the inventor, though he not only produces temporary displacement of labour, and consequent distress, but destroys the utility of much fixed capital, stimulates over-production, and thereby contributes more than any one else to depression of trade. It accepts migration from country to town, which is probably the cause of more distress in London than any immigration of foreigners. It has rather neglected displacements of labour in general, as unfortunate incidents of progress, which may, perhaps, be alleviated by increasing subdivision, and, in some degree, by systematic technical education.¹ Why should it lay stress upon them in this instance alone? Because, it may be said, in this case they are likely to increase: it is not the present evils that are important, but greater evils in the future.

One great migration, however, is open to no economic objection whatever—the great German migration into Russia. The immigrants come,² not as labourers, but as peasant proprietors, attracted by the cheapness of land, and bringing capital with them. The Russian peasant cannot compete with them, because his archaic system of land tenure, with its periodical redistributions, customary rules of cultivation, compulsory rotation of crops, and large area of common pasture and forest, implies large holdings and a less “extensive” and concentrated, and therefore less effective, agriculture. It is stated, too, that the incomers purchase forest (analogous to the wastes of the lords of manors) for conversion into arable, and so deprive the natives of their rights of common over it. Apart from this legal question, it seems clear enough that the objections to this migration are not economic, but social and political. Accordingly, it is on patriotic grounds that the nationalist Press has attacked it: because it seems to endanger the existence of the race. To the Italian migration into France and Switzerland, again, it is not easy to see any economic objection. It would seem merely to supply that labour which (thanks to the neo-Malthusians) is not provided from native sources; and it is not clear that the competition between it and the native labour is very seriously felt, except, indeed, in some branches of unskilled labour, which is necessarily exposed to competition in a special degree. It would seem, in short, that the argument against migration, based on the probable depression of the productive power of the nation, may be balanced by another argument, based on Mr. Wakefield’s doctrine, of the complex co-operation of labour. These immigrants, from their various national or racial peculiarities,

¹ *Political Science Quarterly*, II. 1. p. 57: “The Limits of Competition,” by Professor J. B. Clark.

² *Russische Revue*, vol. xxiii. 1885 (before referred to).

tend eventually, after causing some displacement, to form non-competing groups.¹ They thus promote that varied and diverse production which Mr. Wakefield insisted was the necessary condition of economic progress in new countries, and which American Protectionists have ingeniously turned to the support of their own system. You cannot confine the field of production within a ring fence, and suppose that every foreign immigrant must of necessity compete with some native labourer in some existing trade. At first this competition, of course, takes place, but the new developments of production are limitless, and it is these—often directly, always indirectly—which the incomers tend to facilitate. Most of the arguments brought against the unrestricted immigration of foreign labour would apply with equal force against the introduction of improved machinery or improved methods of economizing labour.

One reason, then, why no modification of economic doctrine is required by the present situation is, that the competition of immigrant with native is not yet permanently established, except perhaps where (as with the Germans in Russia) it is economically justifiable. Another reason, and perhaps a more important one, is this: that the general immobility of labour assumed by orthodox economists, to which reference has been made a few pages back, still exists; and that the movements which have created so much apprehension are due to special and temporary causes.

The causes which keep nations apart are mainly non-economic. It may be added that the economic motive operative in emigration is not desire of wealth, but aversion from starvation. We may well doubt whether the populations most given to emigration emigrate for any other reason than because they cannot help it. Irishmen have migrated pretty freely for the last forty years; but not simply from the desire to better themselves, but because they could not find employment at home. The Chinese emigrate, not because they like it, for they all return as soon as they can; but because they cannot find a livelihood in China. But this is not because Chinese territory is full, but because it is not sufficiently opened up.² Italians migrate, not because there is no room in Italy, for much

¹ As to the Chinese in Australia and New Zealand, see letter (from the capitalist-squatter standpoint) from Mr. Aird, in *Times*, September 4, 1888; Jews in East London, see Mr. Burnett's Report (in *Reports of Inspectors of Factories for 1887*, p. 91); also letter from Hebbert & Co., *Times*, June 12, 1888, stating that for the last twenty to twenty-five years the greater part of the police, railway, and Post-Office uniforms have been made by Jews, and that they could not get Gentile workmen capable of making them.

² Sir J. Pope Hennessy, *Nineteenth Century*, April 1888, p. 617; the Marquis Tseng, *Asiatic Quarterly*, January 1887, pp. 4 and 5. "The emigration from China," he says, "must be imputed rather to the poverty and ruin in which (the emigrants) were involved by the great Taeping and Mohammedan rebellions than to the difficulty of finding the means of subsistence under ordinary conditions. In her wide domains there is room enough to spare for all her teeming population. What China wants is not emigration, but a proper organization for the equable distribution of the population."

of it is practically undeveloped ; but because a defective land system (at least in the South), lack of capital, and a taxation, local and central, estimated at 25 per cent. of the national income, prevent their finding employment at home. Frenchmen themselves emigrate—from parts of France ; but they all return if they can.¹ It seems improbable that any class of emigrants anywhere submit to expatriation from the purely economic motive of “bettering themselves”—that is, supposing they could get on at all at home—except the more educated class of Germans and Englishmen. And the reasons for the emigration of Russian Jews are most distinctly temporary and artificial.

There are three and a-half millions of Jews in Russia,² chiefly crowded together in certain districts of the west and south. In the Black Sea basin they form about one-eleventh, in the South Baltic basin nearly one-seventh, of the population. But in these districts they are mainly confined to the towns, not merely by their own aptitudes, but by the action of the State. Taking urban population, then, their numbers range from 15 per cent. of the total urban population in Ekaterinoslav, and 19 per cent. in the Crimea, to over 60 per cent. in Grodno, Podolia, Kovno, and Minsk ; 71 per cent. in Volhynia—one of the districts, be it noted, most resorted to by German agricultural colonists ; and 94 per cent. in Mohilev. Now, in the last-named government the Jewish districts are only about an eighth of the area of the province. Provision, indeed, is nominally made for the free migration of Jewish merchants, students, and skilled artisans. But the first two classes are not numerous, and the movement of the latter are so hampered with legal restrictions that the permission to migrate is practically worthless. For not only must the artisan possess numerous certificates and two or three varieties of passport, but he cannot acquire a settlement in his new place of abode, he cannot take with him relations unable to support themselves, and he must pass an examination in his trade before the trade guild with whose members he is to compete—an examination which he is not very likely to pass. The Jew cannot acquire land, or manage it ; he cannot settle within fifty versts of the frontier—a law which was made retrospective on the retrocession of Bessarabia ; he is hampered in such trades as he can practise both by the law and still more by the administrative power, especially by the peculiar and almost autocratic powers granted to some local governors. The free circulation of labour is thus checked in every possible way ; the Jew is forced to become a middleman, with the natural economic result to the public of the ex-

¹ The author is informed that in parts of South-East France the best houses are those of returned emigrants from South America—known, with a truly French geographical inaccuracy, as “*Les Mexicains*.”

² For all this see “*Die Juden Frage in Russland*,” by Prince v. Demidoff-Sandonato, in *Russische Revue*, vol. xxiv. 1884. A translation, by Mr. H. Guedalla, has been published at the office of the *Jewish Chronicle*.

cessive increase of that class; and some of the businesses which he may still undertake have been temporarily interfered with by the opening of railways—letting horses for hire, keeping post-stations, hauling goods with teams of oxen, and the like. Meanwhile, the administration of the law and occasional outbursts of popular violence, provoked by grievances which are the inevitable outcome of these absurd economic conditions, afford ample reason for emigration; besides which, there have been many actual expulsions *en masse* from various towns. Moreover, prior to the Berlin Treaty, Jews migrating from Russia could not settle in Roumania, non-Christian foreigners being excluded from naturalization, and therefore from civil rights, by Article VII. of the Roumanian Constitution. This article has since been repealed, but naturalization—for Jews—has been fenced round with such an elaborate system of ingenious checks, that it is still hardly obtainable. Prince Bismarck's expulsion of non-Prussian Poles from Prussian Poland in 1885, and the further attempts at Germanization in that country since, must have affected the Jewish population in Russia and Russian Poland, directly or indirectly, in a very serious degree, both because they were the most depressed class, and because many of those expelled must have been Jews. In all this we have adequate causes for Jewish emigration, but causes which are essentially transitory, and which will tend to lose force—it cannot be said, as the Russian Government learns the elements of political economy, but as the emigration from Russia goes on. Moreover, if that emigration, large as it is, is only altogether four-fifths of the immigration into Russia, we may fairly suppose that the causes at work are abnormal. Moreover, it seems pretty clear that most of the Jewish immigrants in the East End are on their way to the United States—where there is room for them; and Mr. C. W. Fox's article in a recent number of the *Contemporary Review* conclusively shows that, wherever they do go, they do not now come to England in very large numbers. Unfortunately, the official emigration statistics give every information except as to the number of foreigners entering England from the continent of Europe, and the Government have officially announced¹ that they object to ascertaining this because of the practical difficulty of doing so on the great passenger routes—*via* Dover, Harwich, and Sheerness. But the poorest immigrants come by long sea routes, chiefly it would seem *via* Hamburg, and there could be no great difficulty in enforcing the provisions of the Alien Act, simply in order to obtain statistics of their number, a result which would effectually dispel the scare at the East End.

It remains to note some of the non-economic objections against unrestricted foreign immigration—simply to mark them as non-economic. There is, first, the time-honoured argument against the admixture of foreign habits and ideas. This was a common one

¹ Baron H. de Worms, in the House of Commons, September 12, 1887.

with ancient Greek writers ; and, with their small military States and fixity of national type, it was not wholly unjustified. That the commerce which produces such "confusion of type" is the most potent means of civilization is a wholly modern idea, but one which we are hardly likely to abandon ; at any rate, only the extremest supporters of the idea of nationalism—which, after all, is largely a figment of poets and professors—can seriously maintain it now. Then there is the argument as to the danger of intermixture of distinct races. Some one—it may be Bagehot—has compared South America to a vast sociological laboratory, in which experiments are constantly being made in the production of new racial compounds. But laboratories are not at best pleasant or healthy places of residence, and sociological laboratories least of all. The mixed races, as Bagehot has said in *Physics and Politics*, are often not merely something between races, but between moralities, and a nation may fairly object to such physical admixture of type as produces some of the South American results. There is the argument from "apprehended disorders" in the preamble of the new American-Chinese Treaty, now very naturally rejected by the Chinese Government, from patriotic motives rather than economic.¹ There are sanitary reasons, the fear of increasing pauperism, and the like, which are only indirectly economic. With all these we are not here concerned. Economically speaking, increase of productive power is the main end ; and anything—be it machine, Polish Jew, or Chinaman—which tends to increase it permanently is so far good. This good may be neutralized in practice by non-economic considerations ; but science—as Sir W. Hamilton used to say—deals always with the universal and necessary, and the practical applications of the doctrines of economics are for the statesman rather than the economist.

¹ Cf. "The Rejection of the American-Chinese Treaty," *Times*, September 3, 1888.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION: PAYMENT BY RESULTS.

THE elementary education which we give the working population of our country is of vast importance to all classes. Some fifteen or twenty years ago only a very small percentage of our great working masses were able to write or spell their way through a chapter of the Bible or newspaper paragraph. Englishmen had not awakened to the responsibility of enlightening the human machines who performed manual labour. Working men and women grew up in dense ignorance. National Schools existed in those dark ages, and the British and Foreign Society for Promoting Elementary Education bravely endeavoured to mitigate the evil in some measure. In these schools the children of the poor received instruction in reading, writing, and rudimentary arithmetic, for twopence or threepence weekly. If parents cared to avail themselves of the opportunity of affording some education to their children, they might send them to these schools, but if, on the other hand, they grudged the small fee, or wished to profit by the service their children could render, or by their small earnings, they were at perfect liberty to keep them at home, to send them to work in factories, or to let them run wild in the streets and become little savages, until the salutary discipline of going to work to a small extent tamed and civilized them. No compulsion was exercised, no authority intervened higher than the will of the parent. This state of things in our wondrous nineteenth century, and in civilized England, was lamentable. The evil began to make itself keenly felt, for nations decidedly inferior to us in natural resources were counterbalancing their disadvantages by giving their working population superior educational and technical training, and very markedly gaining on us in the hot, hard race for position and place. Such was the commercial view of the matter; the very existence of the country was at stake; therefore, in the interests of commerce, the question of Elementary Education was agitated. Philanthropists had a say in the matter, and pointed out the piteousness of the spectacle of millions of struggling human souls treading the grim byways of earth in dark ignorance. Moralists spoke up, and strove to show that some training of the mental faculties would tend to develop the

higher moral qualities of brain and heart, which were too often permitted to remain dormant. Therefore, in common humanity, something must be done to lessen the evil that was upon us; and our "little, red-coloured, pulpy infants" of the toiling millions, "each of them capable of being kneaded, baked into any form you choose," should be provided with appropriate kneading and baking apparatus, and the process should commence forthwith. The Education Question was warmly discussed and advocated, and, in 1870, Mr. Forster's Education Bill was passed in Parliament. Education became compulsory. The State proclaimed that *every* child in the country *must* be taught to read, to write, and reckon at least, and, in many cases, additional desirable knowledge was to be imparted. New municipal functions sprang into existence, and intelligent and influential citizens were elected members of those great organizing educational bodies known as School Boards. Then sprang up throughout the country all those educational buildings, handsome in design and convenient in internal structure, known as Board Schools. Then hastened all the colleges devoted to the training of elementary teachers to provide instructors for these quickly erected buildings. It was a golden period for a short time for the elementary teacher; the demand for such was in excess of the supply, and thousands of girls and youths presented themselves to fill the vacancies opened up to them as pupil-teachers in the newly built schools. Then were a body of officials, known as School Board officers, invested with authority to go out into the highways, and slums, and back alleys, and compel all luckless urchins who perchance lurked there to come into the big, handsome schools and be duly instructed. Then were all the little ones, who in happy ignorance and dirt ran idly in the streets, snatched from the gutter with its allurements, and driven by Act of Parliament into the handsome new schools. Then were many of the parents irate at the unseemly intervention of Parliament, and complaints and curses resounded in many a back slum; and then arose a great cry from the ratepayers, who were compelled to support, in some part, these new schools. Then the supporters of the scheme, and the politicians, the philanthropists, the moralists, and those who deemed the commercial prosperity of the country at stake, surveyed their work with satisfaction, and looked forward to a golden age "in Merrie England," when the working classes of our busy, prosperous country were to be moral, enlightened, intelligent, well conducted, and skilled in their craft; when crime, and vice, and ignorance were to vanish from our midst, and virtue, and sobriety, and prosperity reign instead. And so the machinery which moves this State education was set in motion. Difficulties loomed darkly ahead, but the vast onward movement met and conquered these. The little untaught "slum-born mites" were pruned and trained, and drilled and taught, and annually subjected to an examination when Her Majesty's Inspectors visited the schools,

and gauged the depths of their instruction, and reported the same to the Education Department, on which Report depended the annual grant to help to keep up the educational machinery of the school.

The obstinate and unenlightened parents, who persisted in flying in the face of a powerful and beneficent Act of Parliament, and refused to send their children to school, were fined and imprisoned, until at length they sullenly gave in, and vented their spleen in occasionally visiting the schools and addressing abusive, threatening, and oftentimes unparliamentary language to the long-suffering teachers, who are only a small part of the vast machinery, and who are bound down by hard and fast regulations from which there is no outlet. Their function is simply to carry out the State regulations, and impart just so much as the Act of Parliament deems fitting.

For seventeen years has this great educational movement been in operation; for seventeen years have my Lords of the Education Department annually exercised themselves in framing and revising the Code, which, be it known to the uninitiated, comprises the rules, and regulations, and curriculum laid down for teachers to follow with unswerving fidelity; for seventeen years teachers have striven anxiously, and oftentimes wearily, to follow the dictates of the Code, and to impart what my Lords would have imparted; for seventeen years have Her Majesty's inspectors visited the schools, and probed and tested and examined and commented on the work as the State desires should be rigidly performed, and for seventeen years children have been passed from infant schools through their standards until they pass the standard or attain the age required of them before they be permitted to leave school. Much "weariness of the flesh" to teachers and taught has resulted during these seventeen years. Many an anxious and striving teacher has fallen in the fierce fight for percentages and passes, wearied out with the struggle; and many a puny starveling and frail and tender little one has been worried and examined into another world, where Board Schools are not.

One generation of Board School children has gone forth into the great world to fight the battle of life amid struggling humanity, and another generation is upon their heels; therefore, we may consider ourselves in a position to judge of the benefits which have resulted from the passing of the Education Act.

We must judge a system by its average products, not by a few dazzling exceptions, nor by a few total failures. Because one bright Board School boy was passed on to the Grammar School, and from thence to the University, and he attained distinction, we must not conclude that the system is unmixed good; nor because a few, feeble nines die in the struggle, are we to conclude that it is unmixed

evil. We must follow the great bulk of those Board School children into the world, and inquire of those among whom they have disseminated themselves. We must compare the commercial prosperity of England with the commercial prosperity of other nations, our artisans with continental artisans, and we must consider if our great working population is in any way wiser, better, helpfuller, and more prosperous than in the days before Board School sway.

In the present day, when the female population preponderates over the male to such an extent that three million out of every six million women work for a living, we should imagine that there would be no difficulty in securing good domestic servants. Yet all household matrons of any experience complain bitterly of the lack of good servants. Surely this ought not to be. Women are eminently fitted for domestic duties, and can it be that an acquaintance with the rudiments of education can unfit a girl for household duties? A girl of thirteen from a good Board School who has passed her sixth or seventh standard is fairly intelligent. She can read fluently, write neatly and accurately, work fractions, decimals, and interest, parse and analyse; she has some slight knowledge of literature, and probably has gone through a play or two of Shakespeare's. She can darn, knit, patch, stitch, and work button-holes; she can cut out a garment, she has attended cookery lessons, and has studied the theory of domestic economy so far as it relates to ventilation, cooking, clothing, and health. Every good Board School turns out a dozen such annually, though by far the greater number never reach this stage of proficiency, and drop off in lower standards as soon as they can escape. One would conclude that an intelligent girl of thirteen who has profited by her school training would be eminently fitted for service, and, if education unfits them for it, it is a fact to be deplored. But matrons say the market is thronged with lady helps, and ladies' companions, and inefficient nursery governesses, who will accept situations for merely a home, so that they may be genteel. These pauper young ladies disdain service. "My maid will not wear a cap, she will not carry a basket, she dresses ridiculously, she buys novelettes and penny periodicals, and wastes her time in dreaming over impossible dukes and countesses." "My maid is impudent; she says she knows more than I, and she reads my letters and concerns herself with my affairs." Such are the constant complaints of ladies of households, who sigh for the good, honest, ignorant, faithful servants of their childhood. This is a levelling age truly. I asked an upper class of Board School girls one day, individually, what calling they intended to adopt after leaving school. Out of a class of thirty I received the following results:—

Seven wished to be teachers; six wished to become shop-girls; five wished to become dressmakers; four wished to become telegraph clerks; three were indefinite and wished to stay at home; two were going to work in a

blue factory; one was going to train for a lady's maid; one wished to study elocution and singing; one was going out as a nurse-girl.

These were the very best girls who had passed their sixth and seventh standards; of course, the majority of girls drop off in Standards IV. and V., before they attain the proficiency of these girls.

We are forced to believe that a good domestic servant is an article which becomes rarer every day, and mistresses blame Board Schools for this. The brightest and best become teachers, clerks, shop assistants, and dressmakers, and it is the shiftless and incompetent who drift off into service, though many of these ultimately go into factories. Girls hate the restraint of service, and are too independent to have a *missus*, so these liberty-loving young damsels betake themselves to the factories. "I consider Board Schools the curse of the country," said a much-injured lady the other day, recounting the injuries inflicted on her by her servants.

Business men complain that boys as apprentices, errand boys, and young clerks lack intelligence. By elaborate processes they can work out elaborate arithmetical problems, but they fail in reasoning out easy practical ones. Board School boys in many cases eschew trades, and throng to become teachers and clerks; skilled craftsmen are rare. Workmen are discontented with their condition. They grumble at the wage and grumble at the hours; strikes are common. The market is glutted with schoolmasters and clerks, thousands are out of employment; and many duly qualified college-trained young schoolmasters, after months of weary waiting for situations, enlist as private soldiers. With all our State educational machinery we, as a nation, are far behind our German neighbours. Whence the bitter complaints that Germans flock by thousands to England and rob our youths and young men of situations in offices, counting-houses, and workshops? These Germans offer *superior qualifications* for inferior wage, and successfully turn our young men out of employment. Labour is cheapened, and the condition of the toiling masses rendered wretched. Wrote a German workman from London to his brother in Hamburg: "There are still some of these confounded English in London." Why are continental nations outstripping us in the race? Is the average English boy duller than the German, the Belgian, or Swiss boy? We English pride ourselves on our thoroughness, dogged determination, and firmness of purpose, and surely English brain power, English thoroughness and completeness may be pitted against the world. How comes it then that foreigners have *superior qualifications* to offer?

England is a mighty nation, and her superior natural resources have made her the "pride of the world," but other nations cultivate intelligence and bring science to their aid.

Education is the art of teaching people *to think*. Continental nations aim at 'educating'; we are content with *cramming*. The criticism passed by Professor Huxley on our education is, "that it is too bookish and not practical."

Herbert Spencer, in summing up "What knowledge is most worth?" awards the palm to science. He says, "That which our school courses leave almost entirely out, we find to be that which most nearly concerns the business of life. Our industries would cease were it not for the information which men begin to acquire, as best they may, after their education is said to be finished." Science underlies all our trades and manufactures. The science of geometry regulates the construction of our railways, bridges, harbours, and viaducts. Chemistry underlies the smelting of copper, tin, zinc, and iron, bleaching, dyeing, sugar refining, soap boiling, and distilling. Upon mechanics depend the properties of the lever, the wheel, and axle, and in these the production of machinery. Astronomy has made possible the art of navigation, and geology aids the industries of coal and iron. All this Spencer clearly shows; therefore, we must recognize the importance of science in training boys for the business of life.

Let us see how our German friends educate their boys for the counting-house and workshop. Mr. Matthew Arnold, in investigating German elementary education, has given us the following subjects taught in their schools: Religion, German, English, geography, history, natural history, natural philosophy, arithmetic, algebra, geometry, writing, drawing, singing, and gymnastic exercise.

The girls, too, in Germany, get some amount of technical training which cultivates the eye and trains the hand, and in the infant schools, under Fröbel's Kindergarten System, the cultivation of the senses receives careful attention; thus, from infancy German children are accustomed to observe, compare, and distinguish, and their fingers are trained to a dexterity of touch, while their bodies are duly regarded in the exercise of healthful kindergarten games, which later on give place to gymnastics. The technical education the boys learn is not so much the teaching of a trade, as the science which underlies trades; hence they become skilled and clever workmen, with inventive brains and capable fingers. The German chemist has a world-wide reputation. The Germans completely revolutionized the sugar trade, by applying a chemical process to produce sugar, and many Germans have made large fortunes out of dyes from the products of English gasworks. England is heavily handicapped in the struggle for commercial distinction: our boys get no technical training, therefore our young men have no chance with foreigners. If our clever boys would rise from the ranks, they study classics and go to the University, and ultimately become poor curates or teachers. But if a practical knowledge of modern languages, "book-

keeping available for commercial purposes," and a general outline of chemistry, light, heat, and electricity were attainable, they might qualify themselves for "workshop, mill, or factory," and become valuable citizens. The English boy in the ordinary Board School learns English, arithmetic, geography, writing, and probably singing, drawing, and Scripture. Before we commence to find fault with our system, and demand that our children shall have equal educational advantages with continental children, we must consider two enormous difficulties under which English children labour, compared with the German child. The German language is phonetic, each written or printed character has a definite sound, without being burdened by a host of exceptions. Our alphabet bristles with anomalies and difficulties: the letter A itself has six separate sounds. A fearful amount of drudgery and grind is exacted from our little ones in compelling them to master the mechanical difficulties of reading and spelling. Little mites in infant classes are forced to spell, spell, spell, with dreary monotony, such combinations as *cough*, *plough*, *through*, *tongue*. Then, as they are passed through their standards, some portion of each day is spent in mechanical spelling, striving to master such words as *psalter*, *schism*, *plague*, and *phlegm*. After drudging for eight or nine years at this exercise of memory, how many of our average boys and girls have mastered the art of spelling? In fact, we may ask how many cultured English men and women may be said to be perfect in this intricate and puzzling art? One sighs, on glancing through a modern school reading-book, at the difficult words to be *learnt*; only the patient teacher and long-suffering child know the labour it entails. It must have been a joyous time for children learning to read before Dr. Johnson laid down hard and fast rules for spelling. Bad and illegible writing may be excused; indeed, it is often an indication of superior culture. I have a lady friend occupying a high position in the educational world, who possesses a testimonial from a certain Bishop, which she concludes is of a highly flattering character, but, as neither she nor anybody else has ever been able to read it, the purport of it is only an inference. Bad spelling, however, stamps one indelibly as ignorant and uneducated. Our Board School children are victims to our absurd, conservative system of spelling. Year by year, by the dictate of the Code, Her Majesty's inspectors subject them to a dictation examination, in which they are required, in a limited time, to write correctly from four to ten lines of dictation, often of a puzzling and intricate nature. Says Max Müller, "In the interests of etymology, I could wish that the common spelling were utterly smashed." Sad it is that "the finest language on earth is presented to the eye in the worst spelling on earth."

A terrible amount of grind is necessary to make the children fulfil the Code requirement in spelling. An English school usually

devotes eight hours per week to spelling alone in the lower standards, and for seven or eight years our children painfully endeavour to master the mechanical difficulties of their language. In a German school two hours per week will suffice for spelling, and a child can master the mechanical difficulties of his language in one year. All the extra time may be devoted to other subjects.

In the *Fortnightly Review* for October 1886, in an article on manual training, Sir John Lubbock pointed out the need for reform in spelling. Again, the English Board School child has to struggle against our barbarous system of coinage and weights and measures, handed down to us by our less enlightened ancestors. In this age of science and reform, this complicated and antiquated system ought to be obsolete. The French and Germans have adopted the decimal system of coinage and weights and measures. Arithmetic in these schools means a mastery of the four simple rules. Happy children whose brains are not tortured by perplexing puzzles of reduction. If only this rational system were introduced into England, the arithmetic at present, which is patiently drummed into Standards III., IV., and V., would vanish at a stroke. At present, teachers spend from five to seven hours weekly in striving to make children reduce sixpences to fourpences, and half guineas to fourpences and the like. An inspector remarked to me a short time ago, "The entire system is useless, but it is not my fault; I did not make the Code. If ever it became necessary for me to practise timber measuring, I could learn the requisite tables in two hours, and so could these children when they are old enough. When dry measure and troy weight is of use to them, they will master it readily enough, but now they drum wearily at it all the year and forget it before it is of practical value to them." While English teachers drudge mechanically in compelling children to spell, and spend toilsome months in making these poor victims to a barbarous system reduce acres to square inches, and as a profitable variation to reduce square inches back to acres, German teachers are quietly instructing their children in English, French, and perhaps Spanish, and training them in scientific principles, so that one day they may shine in the office or workshop.

What science has done for other nations may it not do for us? Sir Stanley Leighton has addressed the *Times* on the subject of technical education, and made some useful suggestions. "Technical instruction," he says, "must be preparatory and supplementary to commercial and industrial apprenticeship, and not a substitute for it, and must be secondary to elementary education." The Education Act of 1870 was a grand step in the right direction, but many evils impede its healthy action and oppress both teachers and taught. The *Times* of December 15, 1887, said: "One of the first reforms to be taken in hand when the Irish Question is removed is the reform

of the Education Office." The very root of the evil is the system of payments by results. There is no such thing as education, but a long course of cram. Each child is regarded as a small machine out of which so much Government grant may be ground. The teacher is the machine grinder, and he who grinds hardest and most earns money and professional reputation. Education is reduced to a question of pounds, shillings, and pence. A certain amount of grant is paid for each child who passes in each subject, therefore the teacher must grind horribly, by threats and even blows and punishments, to compel the little machines to yield the maximum amount of grant. The Code cramps, restrains, and effectually prevents true education. Practically it says to the teacher, "Pass 100 per cent., or take the consequences." So direful are these consequences that a teacher's life becomes one protracted weary struggle to gain percentage, and push all the pupils through on the examination day. There is no time to allow the child's mind to unfold and develop gradually, there is no time to exercise a child's faculty for thought, reason, or judgment. The teacher simply condenses the bare and requisite amount of knowledge into the very narrowest limits, and labours persistently in drilling it into the children, until it clings to them like the burden of an old song. Even parrots might be drilled to make a show at an annual examination if patience and labour were devoted to them. The bright children who crave for "more," like poor, little Oliver Twist, are disgusted at the meagreness of the morsel, and sicken at the repetition; the dull ones grasp, in a mechanical fashion, what is barely requisite, they retain it by constant reiteration until after the examination, and then they may forget it as soon as they please. Let any inspector examine Standard V. children in last year's sums, and he will find half the class cannot do them. The teacher is not to blame; his duty is to drag up *all* his pupils, dull and stupid, bright and clever alike, to passing pitch: upon this monstrous task rests his reputation. The very foundation of the Code is utterly illogical and false; it presupposes that all children have the same capabilities, the same advantages, that all attend with the same regularity, and that all start fairly in the race. To fail to pass a dull child, who is probably half starved, and who has only attended school half time, is visited upon the teacher in the same manner as the failure of a clever child who is well fed and has attended school regularly. Suppose a doctor were expected to cure *every* patient, or a clergyman to convert every sinner, or a barrister to win every case, and that professional disgrace and financial loss were entailed upon them on failure to do this, we fancy they would complain bitterly of their lot. Yet a teacher is expected to pass every child, and he can no more make a born dunce intelligent than a physician can make whole the patient who has inherited insanity. Some teachers, by sheer

mechanical drill, obtain high percentages, but the children are little machines. We do not want *machines*: what the nation wants is thinking, reasoning men and women, and until some change is made in the system of elementary education this end will never be attained. Children are forced unnaturally to attain one dead level: the brightest and best may go no higher, and the weakest and poorest must be strained up to this point—the passing point. Nothing further is demanded of them. Every individual human soul has natural tendencies and capabilities which ought to be encouraged, but these must be lopped off or utterly neglected, that a dull dead level may be attained. Suppose a glass-house were erected over a row of young hops, and they were all required to climb straight up a pole and touch the roof, any straying tendencies were checked, and any attempts to go further nipped ruthlessly, they were forced in an unnatural atmosphere up to the roof, and then the glass-house were removed, and they were left to their fate and the cold winds of heaven. This is the position of our children to-day; they are forced by some means, fair or foul, to pass, and then when the process is over they are left in an unnatural condition to face the bleak world. And the opinion the world passes upon them is that they are unfitted for their condition.

The morality which children learn in Board Schools is this. If they can get their sums and dictation right, they are *virtuous*; if they cannot, they are *vicious*. And the latter kind must be bullied, threatened, punished, and kept in, until life becomes a burden to them. Not long since I was taken through a model Board School, where hundreds of little machines were made to yield the maximum amount of grant. The mistress was a capable and worthy woman, who obtained excellent results and the highest percentages. She reviewed the work of some eighty fearful mites with stern impartiality, and separated those who had four long division sums marked "*Right*" from the rest, much as one would imagine the final separation of the sheep and goats to be effected. "These," she said to me blandly, pointing to the sheep, "are my *good* girls; they may run into the playground for ten minutes." "And these are the *bad* ones," and she frowned severely on the troubled and anxious goats. Those with one sum wrong were condemned to stay in after school to work *four* more sums with perfect accuracy, and the hopeless little sinners with two or more sums wrong were caned as well as being made to stay in. By such means as these teachers sometimes attain high results, and money and credit fall to their lot. Poor little Board School mites! The great question of right and wrong, good and evil, resolves itself for you into mechanical accuracy at sums. The unwise and kind-hearted teacher, who would strive to meet the requirements of child nature, who would develop children's faculties in natural order, who would satisfy the eager craving of the brightest

by taking them higher, and relax the stern tension somewhat from the dull, the delicate, and half-starved, who would encourage thought and reason, who would hold up lofty moral truths, and debase what is low and mean, is soon forced to yield his theories and practices if he would live by his profession. The individuality of teacher and pupils is crushed out in the frantic endeavour to cram and pass. Any humane code would permit the teacher to hold out his hand to the puny, the weak, and the struggling, and give them a chance in the great struggle of life; but the teacher must do this at his peril: his reputation as a teacher is at stake, and that means his daily bread. The Education Department does not pay him for sympathy or fine feeling, no such sentimentality enters into the compact. "Produce for us passes" is the demand, and the teacher must do it, or his pocket suffers, his certificate suffers, for a condemnatory entry thereon ruins him. Say the inspectors to him, "Gain a good percentage, or lose the merit grant." Say the members of the Board, those influential citizens who look after the expenditure of public money in the cause of education, "Gain so much grant, or lose your situation." And so the worried teacher is goaded on until he is ready to adopt any means to procure passes, and *good* passes, for it is strictly enjoined that on that depends the merit grant. Two sums right will pass a child, but four sums right is a *good pass*. Therefore the teacher must get good passes at any cost. Bitter enough is the life of thousands of sickened and weary-hearted teachers, and hundreds of thousands of tortured little ones, and hundreds fall in the struggle and quietly drop out of existence; but what recks this great educational State machinery? On it moves, slowly and surely grinding out joy from millions of hearts and life from some weary bodies.

The system of payments by results is monstrous. Not in any continental country is one farthing dependent upon examination results, nor the continual anxiety to strive to pass every child; no system so unreasonable and illogical exists elsewhere. Teachers do not consider what subjects may benefit a child, but what pays. "Why are the girls taking mechanics?" I inquired, in a certain higher grade school. "We must earn more grant, and some of them pass." "Do they not find it dull and uninteresting?" "Yes; and they wish to give it up, but we cannot afford to let them do so." The arrangement in that excellent school was to teach so many sciences, and compel all the boys and girls to attend these classes, for the sake of the money earned by them if they passed. It would seem that things are reversed, and that children exist for the sake of the schools, instead of schools existing for the sake of the children. Said a continental inspector, in reporting on our elementary education: "In the schools in England one can see exactly how things ought not to be done."

It were well that something were done, and done quickly, to educate our children. At present they leave school as early as they can, heartily sick of the whole concern, and in one year forget what they have miserably and laboriously acquired in seven or eight. Only about four per cent. of Board School children take advantage of classes and lectures in after-life to advance their knowledge ; therefore we see they have contracted no love for learning. English workmen have less enlightenment and less intelligence than continental workmen, and in this age of competition only the fittest survive ; “the weakest go to the wall,” and are trampled under foot. Pitiably enough is the spectacle to witness the struggles of thousands of our fellows failing in life’s battle because their armour is weak and inefficient. That the greatness of the English nation is threatened is a stern fact, which sooner or later we must face, and the sooner the better.

The present age is an age of examinations, and one day history will record the hollowness and artificiality of our system.

HOME AFFAIRS.

THE dullest month of the year politically has provided us with serious matter for reflection. The apparent want of energy in carrying on the great contest of the time, has given pain to Mr. Davitt, and we have had emphatic warning—not a bit too soon—that a mere exhibition of silent sympathy, or a slight advance upon this attitude, will not satisfy the more earnest workers in the cause of Ireland, or keep a people suffering untold miseries from taking the bit into their teeth and going their own way. Mr. Davitt's language has been reprobated in quarters where one would have looked for something very different. The *Daily News* might have made allowance for a man, who, being a daily witness of scenes of eviction, had been wrought up to the highest pitch of indignation by the merciless cruelty which, in Ireland, is supported and inflicted by the agents of the law. And, at any rate, it was not necessary, in seeking to refute Mr. Davitt's attack, to cover him with abuse which actually recalled the fact that he was a convicted felon! Mr. Davitt's services to his country, in these later years, entitle him to very different treatment from those who have any sort of sympathy with the claim for Irish popular rights. It may be that he was a little bit premature, possibly a trifle unreasonable, but on the whole we are, for ourselves, prepared to take meekly the reproach of the speech at Knockaroo. It is, in fact, a confirmation of what we have said again and again in this place, that nothing but constant "pegging away" will satisfy the necessities of the case in regard to Ireland, and give the Irish people patience to support the sufferings which are their certain portion pending the advent of the better time.

Admitting so much, it must be pleaded that Mr. Gladstone is less open to the suggestion of apathy than any of the public men of our own side in politics. Like others, he would have been justified in taking holiday during the holiday season, but so far from this, he has made five long speeches during the month, two of them being wholly political and of high importance. Moreover, one of his political addresses was made in the face of a storm of protest which, while suggesting that Mr. Gladstone was anxious to destroy the character of a Welsh non-political institution, had for its real object merely a desire to close the mouth of a formidable critic. First Mr. Gladstone addressed the Burslem Liberals at Hawarden. The excursionists, being

largely engaged in the production of pottery, had presented Mr. Gladstone with a specimen of their handicraft. A handsome vase had been embellished with a design to mark the direction of Mr. Gladstone's present occupations. Emblematic figures of Ireland and Poland were prominent in relief. Naturally, Mr. Gladstone made a little text of the design, and, without pretending to institute a general comparison, said he doubted whether in Poland they could adequately parallel the condition of Ireland. Another declaration in the same speech produced a sharp controversy. Mr. Gladstone, in a vigorous passage, returned to the subject of the treatment of Irish political prisoners, and, drawing upon his personal experiences at Naples in 1852, declared with emphasis that King Bomba did not put his political prisoners into the company of felons. On the instant, all the watch-dogs of the Government gave full tongue. The famous pamphlet published by Mr. Gladstone at the time, being turned up, it was found complaint was there made that certain prisoners, who had been convicted of high treason, *were surrounded by felons*. The discovery was hailed with noisy triumph, and the Government prints lost no time in flourishing it in the face of Mr. Gladstone with much angry comment.

When he spoke at Wrexham some few days later, the right hon. gentleman naturally dealt with the matter. He very frankly admitted, as he had previously told a correspondent, that after the lapse of thirty-seven years he had forgotten the fact dug up from the pamphlet. But he pointed out that these particular prisoners had been tried and convicted of high treason against the Government of Naples, that their lives had been forfeit, and that they might have been executed. There was consequently no sort of comparison between the offences of these men and the offences of the Irish members; and in Naples, certainly, prisoners convicted of minor political offences, were neither subject to compulsory association with criminals nor to any wearing of the prison uniform. His language in regard to Poland having also been objected to, Mr. Gladstone took occasion to explain the very limited nature of his reference, and went on to mention that Austria had secured the affections of the Poles of Galicia by the timely concession of Home Rule, so that Austria—of which he rarely had to speak favourably—was in advance of this pattern kingdom of ours. In the same speech Mr. Gladstone again took up the Mandeville case, and made a fresh onslaught upon the policy which must, in part at any rate, be held responsible for the death of the deceased. It was highly discreditable that whilst Mr. Mandeville was suffering from an attack of colic he should have been kept on a bread-and-water diet. The right honourable gentleman made effective use of the fact that no action had followed upon the verdict of the jury which pronounced against the Irish prison system, although, as he pointed out, the jury consisted of four or more well-

known Tories, and of the sexton of the Protestant church at Mitchels-town, who might safely be reckoned as one.

Here Mr. Gladstone might have gone farther. We know that the jury was summoned by the police, who were very averse to an inquest, and it has been said, by those who ought to know, that it was such a jury as no Nationalist would have thought of summoning. Yet it is certain that the verdict was a unanimous one, and was accurately based upon the facts given in evidence. And the further lapse of time has shown that the Mandeville inquiry has not been altogether thrown away on Mr. Balfour. The release of Mr. John Dillon may be put down as the result of a desire to avoid any such catastrophe as followed the incarceration of Mr. Mandeville. Balfourism is after all compelled to take some sort of note of public opinion. It is perhaps a detestable necessity to the Chief Secretary; if he were wiser than he is, it would be a proof to him of the fatuity of the policy on which he has launched himself. A Coercion Minister who believes that twenty years of "resolute government" is the only thing which will save the sister country, should not have any such scruples as would appear to have arisen in respect of the treatment of Mr. Dillon. It is sheer weakness, from the view of Mr. Balfour, to give a point to the popular agitation at the present moment, and the release of Mr. Dillon is the gift of many points. Everywhere the Irish are rejoicing at it as a rebuff to coercion. And who shall say that they do not rightly interpret the incident? For the English friends of Ireland there is encouragement in the new freedom of the member for East Mayo. He comes out of gaol less physically strong, but mentally as vigorous as ever, and even more determined to carry on the work to which he has given his life. It may be hoped that the end of the holidays will see the end of the period of inaction on this side of St. George's Channel, and that the impatience of Mr. Davitt—of which we ourselves make no complaint—may find no further opportunity of making itself heard. It is rather matter for congratulation that Mr. Davitt's attitude has not found sympathy among other of the Irish leaders. Mr. William O'Brien has, however, gone out of his way to speak on the other side, and there ought consequently to be no difficulty in promptly putting ourselves right with the Irish people. A well-grounded suspicion of the insincerity of the Liberal rank and file, would work enormous mischief in unhappy Ireland.

A people living under the continual menace of eviction, and daily witness of the tyrannical exercise of legal rights, may rightly demand from their friends a generous interpretation of their acts. And if we did not know what we do of the eviction campaigns at Coolroe and in the Woodford districts, we should not be disposed to censure the unhappy victims of landlord rapacity for making the best physical protest in their power against those who would throw them homeless

upon the mercy of the world. But if ever there were cases where criticism may be freely exercised, it is in regard to the conduct of Lord Clanricarde and Mr. Byrne of Coolroe. The merits of the quarrel between the noble lord, who has his quarters in the Albany, and the poor people who find a miserable existence on the hill-sides around Woodford in County Galway, are justly appreciated by every intelligent person who takes an interest in the condition of the Irish peasantry. Lord Clanricarde may protest, but the general sense of the community has determined that his claims are utterly merciless. In the case of Mr. Byrne, it was distinctly declared by the magistrate who was putting the law into force against the tenants, that the offer made was a reasonable one. Yet the offer was contemned, and the landlord took his pound of flesh. The estate was a small one; but at Woodford, Lord Clanricarde cleared a whole townland in a week, throwing one hundred persons out on the roadside to take the luck which might come to them. At Coolroe this was not the end of the tenants' misery. Being convinced of the heartlessness of the action taken against them, the tenants resisted in the true spirit of Wexford men, and to-day a dozen or more of them find themselves in gaol under sentences of imprisonment varying from ten to three months. They have the comfort of knowing (if it is any comfort) that Mr. William Redmond, M.P.—a Wexford man like themselves—is in prison with them. Mr. Redmond, being present at the evictions, is said to have illegally encouraged the resistance of the tenants. He admits that, when he saw the "crowbar brigade" and the police baffled in the attack on Somers's "castle," he called out to the defenders, "Bravo, my boys; I am proud of you!" And for this—which could by no possibility bring a man punishment in England—Mr. Redmond was sentenced to three months' imprisonment. He took his luck without complaining, declared that he would not appeal, and was promptly marched off to prison.

We venture to think that this conduct of Mr. Redmond is likely to give Mr. Balfour more trouble than he wots of. The power of the Irish leaders consists largely in the fact that they do not "funk" the risks of their followers, and the men of Wexford will find fresh strength from the demonstration that the captain and the soldier are again suffering together. Mr. J. E. Redmond, M.P., is expecting in the course of a few days to join his brother in prison. A charge of intimidation lodged against him, has been duly investigated by the magistrates, who have postponed giving their decision until they have before them Mr. Walsh (a Wexford editor), also concerned in the charge. Mr. Walsh is recovering from an operation on his eyes. By-and-by Mr. Kelly, M.P., will go to prison, and possibly Mr. "Mat" Harris, M.P., so that Mr. Balfour will soon be able to claim that he has redressed the balance since he released Mr. Dillon. But the advantage—the advantage? Mr. Balfour may empty and fill his

gaols as he pleases ; but what is he going to do for the 10,000 families now under notice of eviction—50,000 souls in all—or for that still larger number of persons whom a bad harvest has once more thrown upon the verge of starvation ? The Chief Secretary will find this a problem not to be solved by locking and unlocking the prison doors, by the appointment of a Superintendent of Agricultural Prices, or by the issue of doubtful statistics which tell, *inter alia*, of the growing deposits in Irish savings banks, and it would be a satisfaction to know that he has the same notion of the importance of his duty in this larger matter that he has of his function as a chief commissioner of police. So far, however, Mr. Balfour has given no sort of sign that he has any capacity whatever for constructive legislation, or any desire to engage in it. He is seemingly quite content with the reputation which he achieves—among his political friends and allies—as gaoler.

We have witnessed the preliminary encounter between Mr. Parnell and the *Times* newspaper before the Special Commission of Judges. To us it was wholly satisfactory ; we question whether it was satisfactory to the *Times*, or to the Government which is responsible for the Act of Parliament which governs the Commission. The “old friend” of Mr. Walter could hardly have foreseen the methods of interpretation applied to the Act by Sir James Hannen and his colleagues. It was laid down, in the first place, that the inquiry was restricted, as to persons and charges, to such, of both, as were mentioned in the case of *O'Donnell v. Walter*. Next, it was announced that the inquiry would be conducted, in the first instance, as though it were an issue directed, between the *Times* and the persons charged by it, to try the truth or falsehood of the allegations made. Further, the inquiry would be conducted judicially, and, as far as circumstances would permit, according to the rules of procedure and evidence prevailing in the courts of justice. If the parties could not agree upon the point, the Court thought the *Times* should open the proceedings, “and tender such evidence as they may think fit in support of the charges they have made.” The case should, moreover, be opened after the fashion of an ordinary action. So far the views of the Commissioners unasked. When Sir Charles Russell came to make his applications for the Parnellites, the decisions of the Court continued to run in his favour. The right of inspection of all documents produced or read by the Attorney-General in the *O'Donnell* case was promptly conceded. Counsel for the *Times* objected to an order for the discovery of further documents in the possession of his clients, alleging that the Court had no power to compel such discovery, and protesting, with some amount of warmth, against a course which would put the *Times* in the position of litigants in the case, whereas their true position was that of witnesses merely. On his side, Sir Charles Russell professed a willingness to accept an order for discovery subject to certain restrictions. He appeared for the whole eighty-five members of the

Nationalist party in Parliament, but it was admitted that the allegations against particular members were limited, and it would be absurd to require eighty-five men to make so many affidavits when only five or six were really charged. Therefore, accepting an order for discovery, he wanted particulars as to the persons against whom allegations were made. Again, before they could know what the documents were which were required from his clients, they must know what the allegations were. Here a remarkable incident occurred. Mr. Graham again protested against the attempt to put the *Times* in the position of parties to a litigation, and the following interesting colloquy took place :—

Sir J. Hannen : Can you substantiate any charge?

Mr. Graham : Your lordships are going to inquire—

Sir J. Hannen : Yes, yes ; but the question is what are *you* going to do. Do you propose to substantiate any of the charges?

Mr. Graham : We will give you all the information in our power, which, coupled with other evidence, forms certain charges and allegations.

Sir J. Hannen : Which charges?

Mr. Graham : Well, I cannot tell you yet. I am not now in a position to tell you which.

A little later on the dialogue was resumed in this fashion :—

Sir J. Hannen : The question is, what do you know at present? That is what you are asked for—the persons against whom charges and allegations have been made.

Mr. Graham : We *do not make any charges and allegations against particular persons*. We say that this organization [the Irish Land League] has been acting in this way.

Sir J. Hannen : You are quite entitled to assume the position that you decline to say against what persons you have made allegations, and what the allegations are. You decline to say what allegations you make. What you say amounts to this, "Let the Court find out for itself." If you do not give me the assistance I ask for, of course I shall do it for myself, but, in the meantime, I am asking you.

Hardly less noteworthy was the following :—

Sir J. Hannen : Who made the charges and allegations that the Legislature has directed us to inquire into? Did nobody make them? They are charges and allegations against particular persons in the course of particular proceedings.

Mr. Graham : The allegations were made by the Attorney-General, and what they were appears from his speech.

Sir J. Hannen : Did the Attorney-General make no charges against individuals?

Mr. Graham : He made charges against the organization, and no doubt by inference against individuals. What we are charging is the whole organization that has been working the Land League movement.

Sir J. Hannen : I do not doubt it ; *but that is not what we are inquiring into*, but the charges and allegations against persons.

The colloquy wound up by Mr. Graham declaring, "If your lordships ask me to give particulars as to who are the persons charged,

I cannot do so." After a brief adjournment, the President gave the decision of the Court on the points raised. They were of opinion, he said, that they had power to direct discovery of documents; and they would make an order upon both sides alike. The Court was further of opinion that particulars of persons and charges, demanded by Sir C. Russell, should be given. It was agreed that the affidavits of discovery should be ready a week in advance of the opening of the inquiry proper, and the opening of the Commission was postponed until October 22. An application by Sir C. Russell to issue a commission to take the evidence of Patrick Egan in the United States was pronounced premature, the President saying that he hoped Mr. Egan would find it convenient to attend and take advantage of the indemnity clause of the Commission Act. Finally, a conditional order was made, to issue on the 18th of October, for the release of Mr. John Dillon, one of the persons charged by the *Times*, but this order was rendered inoperative by the action of the Irish Executive, which, within forty-eight hours of the sitting of the Commissioners, set Mr. Dillon at liberty, as already stated. It was mentioned by Mr. Graham, who on his part obtained an order for the production of the banking accounts of the Land League, that he should later on ask for the attendance of two persons undergoing long terms of penal servitude. They are, of course, to be put forward as witnesses for the *Times*.

It is hardly necessary to add anything in the way of comment to this *résumé* of the proceedings of the Commission. But we cannot refrain from pointing out how thoroughly the action of the Court justifies the tactics of the Opposition in their efforts to amend the Commission Bill when it was before the House of Commons. By successive orders, the Commissioners have indeed practically incorporated into the Act under which they sit, the leading amendments moved from the Opposition benches and rejected with contumely by the Ministerialists. It is childish for the organs of the Government to turn round and say (after the event), "You see, you might have trusted the Commission." The deception is too obvious. As a matter of fact, nothing has surprised them more than the conduct of the Commission. They did not reckon on it, and it was unfair to send the Nationalists before a Commission with so much which was vital to them, left in the dark. As to the attitude taken before the Commissioners by the *Times*, it is nothing short of humiliating. Here are the people, who have been defying the Nationalists for months past to take them into a court of justice, whining about being put into the position of litigants. Worse than this, after professing that their charges and accusations were nothing if not personal, they tell the whole world that they do not charge persons, but launch their arrows at an organization. Was there ever such a "come-down"? No doubt the *Times* were at a disadvantage by the

non-appearance of the Attorney-General. Sir R. Webster persists in holding a brief for Mr. Smith's "old friend"—Mr. Walter. It is a rank scandal—neither more nor less; and the Government who permit it cannot escape the suspicion that they are not unwilling to stand in the position of prosecutors of an important Parliamentary party. The failure of the *Times* (if it should happen) will be the failure of the Government, and we cannot doubt that the great mass of electors will take due note of the attitude which the Executive is assuming in this serious investigation.

Meantime, Mr. Chamberlain has begun the Unionist winter campaign at Bradford by going "bald-headed" in defence of the Government. The member for West Birmingham tells us that the Irish tenants enjoy more privileges than any other tenantry in the world, and "*it is impossible, therefore, that the evictions now taking place can be unfair or unjust.*" This with the facts of the Woodford and Coolroe evictions in his possession! Again, he declares that the coercion now complained of is only the enforcement of the law, and denies that *the law is unjust*. We can well believe with Mr. Chamberlain, after this, that the healing of the breach in the Liberal party is becoming impossible. The suggestion was made at Bradford to alter the title of the Birmingham Radical Union to that of "The National Liberal Union." Why take two bites at the cherry? "The National Tory Union" would, after all, be more accurate, especially now that the "local organizations of the Conservative and Liberal Unionist party are advised to postpone differences, to secure the most cordial and harmonious co-operation, and to establish free interchange of communication, so as to make arrangements in advance in reference to all contested elections and other matters of common interest." The greater comprises the less, and the Liberal Unionists are part of the Tory phalanx. Mr. Chamberlain has all but gone over. He fancies he will be able to foist his particular views upon his Tory friends, and thus to justify himself to his conscience. Yet we find the *Standard* telling him, *a propos* of his recent Preface to the *Birmingham Daily Post* scheme for the settlement of the Irish question, that his proposals must be relegated to a dim and distant future; that their present interest is merely academic; and that, when—after the final restoration of the law in Ireland—they come up for examination, "the Birmingham Essayist himself may be less in love with them." This, no doubt, is unkind; but, to tell the truth, much as Mr. Chamberlain trumpets his scheme, nobody but himself will enter upon the public discussion of it.

The British Association meeting at Bath was of average interest, but it cannot be said that it was in any way remarkable. The President (Sir F. Bramwell) told us that we had passed the age of steam, and had entered upon the age of electricity. Consequently, it was not surprising to find the electricians taking up a very prominent

position at the Congress. The exact nature of electricity as a force has yet to be ascertained, and we have been told since that we may be on the verge of some important revelations in this regard. This indeed seems to be the one scientific fact of value which has issued from the Bath meeting. To our mind, the controversial politics of the Economic section are entirely out of place. It is a distinct declension for the British Association to make an opportunity for the outcasts of the defunct Social Science Congress. The doctrines of *laissez faire* in political economy, of the Socialists, as we know them in England, with the incidence of taxation and the questions of bi-metallism, of the enfranchisement of leaseholds, and of over-population, are no doubt very important in their way; but they have rightly no place in an Association whose first object is the advancement of pure science, and we protest against the tendency which they have to monopolize public attention at the meetings of the Association. In the Geographical section the experts spoke confidently of the safety of Mr. Stanley, but the news since received of the assassination of Major Barttelot, and of the general state of affairs in the regions about and beyond Stanley Falls, has again revived gloomy apprehensions. The condition of the interior of the Dark Continent is just now a matter of high public interest throughout Europe, and the launching of the Imperial British East African Company under a Royal Charter promises to produce a great demonstration of the rival capacities of the English and German peoples for this particular kind of enterprise.

The panic produced at the East End of London by a succession of horrible murders and mutilations, in which women of a certain class are the victims, has exhibited our detective police in a hopeless state of fog. They are absolutely without any certain trace of the assassins. Naturally there is much nervousness in the district, and a general outcry for some new departure at Scotland Yard. The *Daily Telegraph*, as its contribution to the numerous suggestions which are being made, holds that the first thing is to get rid of that "fantastic failure"—the Home Secretary.¹

THE FUTURE OF THE WEST INDIES.¹

THERE can be no doubt that the British West Indies have recently attracted public attention to an extent to which for fifty years they have been strangers. Their striking Court at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition of 1886, and the literature there distributed, set up a definite inquiry for them as possible homes for the English emigrant ; and this spirit of inquiry is gaining strength every year. Yet there is still no part of the British dominions concerning which it is so difficult for the public to obtain practical contemporaneous information. If this defect were supplied by some organized system of intelligence concerning them, these colonies would at once take their place as one of the most inviting fields of English enterprise.

This is a fitting moment for a review of their present condition. They have just completed half a century of reformed existence. On the 1st of August 1838 the rule of freedom was made absolute throughout her Majesty's West Indian Colonies. The celebration of this jubilee has passed off quietly enough ; there has been no repetition of the public thanksgivings, the songs and the feastings, the bonfires and the dances, which marked the consummation of Wilberforce's life. One or two of the colonies have sent loyal addresses to the Crown from the Queen's subjects of African descent ; one or two have declared public holidays to commemorate the event ; one or two have held public banquets ; and thus the great anniversary passed quietly by.

The abolition of slavery, if an unmeasured blessing to the negro race, dealt a serious blow to the commercial prosperity of the British West Indies. The Englishman, when he makes up his mind to a reform, usually does it, " not wisely, but too well." Emancipation completely upset the balance of society in these colonies. For a time the blow to planting and commerce seemed crushing. But British

¹ *The English in the West Indies ; or, the Bow of Ulysses.* By John Anthony Froude. Longmans & Co.

The Caribbean Confederation. A Plan for the Union of the Fifteen British West Indian Colonies, in which is embodied a Refutation of the Chief Statements made by Mr. Froude in his recent work, *The English in the West Indies.* By C. S. Salmon. Cassell & Co.

Down the Islands, a Voyage to the Caribbées. By William Agnew Paton. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

The Land of the Pink Pearl ; or, Recollections of Life in the Bahamas. By L. D. Powles. Sampson Low & Co.

The Vegetable Resources of the West Indies. An address delivered before the Chamber of Commerce. By D. Morris, M.A., F.L.S.

pluck, Mr. Froude must admit, remained even to the West Indies. Some men fell in the fight, but others took their place in the ranks ; some estates fell out of cultivation, but the sorely tried sugar was supported by new industries. The islands weathered the storms born of planters' first despair and freed men's long indifference. Gradually society began to establish itself on a new basis. Slowly commerce grew into a moderate prosperity. And to-day the islands still rise above the blue Caribbean, beautiful as they first met the gaze of Columbus, fertile as in the days of the old buccaneers, and with elements of prosperity not less, but in many ways greater, than in the days when sugar sold in Mincing Lane for £60 a ton, and when a West Indian heiress had the society of London at her command.

What part, then, has the negro race played in this revival? What moral and material progress has it made in fifty years of freedom?

Mr. Froude and Mr. Salmon answer the question in different ways. To the former the negro seems essentially idle and sensuous, with no capacity for self-guidance, and an over-mastering tendency backwards to the early superstitions of his race. Mr. Salmon extols him as the type of a free and noble tropical people ; he paints him pretty much as a Briton with a black skin, as one capable of all things if only unfair restraints are loosened. Both writers have got something of the truth ; but perhaps Mr. Froude has hit off that side of the picture which demands for the moment the more practical attention.

If fifty years of freedom have been enjoyed by the West Indian negroes, they have for scarce half that period experienced a fair share of its blessings. The manner of emancipation was not well-judged ; the mass of estate owners were distressed and irritated ; the quondam slaves were delirious and intractable ; every effort to obtain their services for field-labour was regarded as a covert attempt to restore slavery ; there was no confidence between man and man in the colonies, and matters were made worse by intense bitterness of feeling against the metropolitan Government. We speak generally, admitting that there were isolated exceptions both in the islands and on estates. As work seemed to the negro to be slavery, he turned to the woods to find a certainty of freedom ; hence arose that system of squatting, and that tendency to what is known as prædial larceny, which even now remain the curses of West Indian agriculture. This unrestrained life in the high woods took many families beyond the reach of civilization ; their wants were few, and they were easily supplied ; they had the sun and the mountain streams ; yams and eddoes, plantains and bread-fruit, mangoes and oranges were ready to their hand ; they had plenty to eat, they needed no clothes, and they were free. For a time the labour problem looked desperate. Earl Grey, one of the most thoughtful of Colonial Secretaries, was

fairly beaten by it. Seeking in legislation the remedy for the evil, he first tried to reach the negro by heavy taxation, and so force him to work; latterly he attributed the greater blame to the planter, and sought to free all food imported. The policy of coolie immigration from Hindustan had the desired effect. We have sometimes doubted whether Colonial Governments should rightly have subsidized such a system; but we are bound to admit that it has proved, even to the negro race, a boon which cannot easily be repaid. The coolie entered into competition with the African. There were times of drought when the ground provisions failed; there were parts of the colonies where a woodland life was not readily obtainable; thus it was that the coolie's presence was felt. In part necessity, and in part a sense of rivalry, brought the negro back into touch with the Government. The gradual failure of the semi-responsible legislatures and the general establishment of the Crown's absolute power gave a great impulse to the advance of the black race. The Government of Great Britain had freed the slaves, and wherever it resumed executive control it displayed its sense of responsibility for the negro's welfare. The efforts of the Church and the missionaries were supplemented by the general improvement of elementary education; public works for the development of the colonies were pressed on without hindrance from jobbery or corruption. The same spirit was caught up by places where "Crown Colony" is still a dreaded term. British Guiana followed slowly on the same lines. Barbados had an easier problem to solve, for it had a large population, who must work if they would not starve. Thus little by little moral and intellectual growth revived. It was by no means all the work of statesmen. *Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona*: there were black men of intellect before emancipation: the efforts of missionaries of all sects were zealous, and bore good fruit. But of recent years the tendency of the West Indian executive has been to bestow its chief care upon the comfort and training of the Queen's black subjects of African race. Whatever may still be wanting, there is a vast deal already being done. In each of the colonies of Jamaica, Trinidad, and British Guiana, considerably more than one-ninth of the general revenue is devoted to the medical care of the poor; in each case the medical departments would be an honour to any country; and the smaller colonies are equally lavish. The proportion of the Budget devoted to education is in Jamaica one-fifteenth, in Trinidad one-eighteenth, in British Guiana one-sixteenth: not so striking as the disbursement for medical relief; but it is a wise policy to minister to the body before you educate the mind.

It is, then, only recently that the black man has begun to play a prominent part in the revival of the West Indies. It would be going too far to argue, as Mr. Salmon probably would do, that the revival was contemporaneous with the recognition of the negro's abilities and

claims. The foundation of this revival was laid without the black man, and often in spite of him. But none are so quick to feel the benefit as he; none are showing greater capacity to profit by the currents of the advancing tide. In one direction especially the race is carving out a career for itself. All over the islands the thriftier blacks are becoming peasant proprietors, who grow their sugar, or coffee, or cocoa, and dispose of it to the local merchants. Grenada is full of them, Montserrat has very many, Jamaica finds them becoming yearly a more important section of her inhabitants. The negro has taken kindly to the land from the first: so long as he could squat and pay nothing he did little but mischief; now that the Government has awaked and he has to acquire or rent his plot, he has become a regular contributor to the agricultural wealth of his island; his methods are crude, and he is too often under the thumb of the merchant, but he is becoming wiser every year, and where there is a Crown Government he always meets with encouragement and protection. Even the ordinary field-labourer usually has a plot of ground, either his own, or as the appanage of his connection with the estate on which he works; here he grows enough provisions for his family for a great portion of the year, and often he has some over for his wife to take to the weekly market. The Jamaican labourer who goes down to Panama and makes a small pile at the canal works, if happily he returns to his island, invests his savings in land and fulfils the destiny of his race. The spirit of commercial enterprise has been very widely awakened in the negro; his standard of comfort is improving; he only asks to be kept free from political agitation, and to be allowed to acquire his land, his little cottage, his goats, and a mule or a pony, and thereafter to see his savings mount up in the nearest savings-bank. The fear that such men will fall back into savagery is to our mind problematical, and when Mr. Froude refers to it he ignores the guardianship of the British Government, and the results which it is fostering.

The negro is eminently a man who wants managing, and yet he is remarkably easy to manage. Firmness and good temper alone are required to rule him. Yet it is astonishing how few can possess those qualities; the history of labour in the West Indies is a record of misunderstanding between master and man: the creole is as much in fault as any new-comer from England. Here and there a man is met who has the happy manner required, and he never grumbles because he gets no labourers or has to pay too highly; we have seen a few such, but they are the exception. The officials of Government who have to employ labour are rarely found in any difficulties: it is not so much that their own training fits them for the management of others, as that the negro has confidence in the word of the employer. Where a black man likes his master it is wonderful with what patience he works away under the tropical sun; we have seen

black boatmen who were pulling up-stream along a deep tropical river, for nearly five hours, with scarcely a rest, bright and cheery from start to finish, because they were fond of the young master who sat in the stern. Light-hearted and humorous himself, the negro loves a cheery word or kindly rally; if he grumbles, a jest brings him back to himself. Persevering and faithful by nature, he is discouraged if he does not find personal interest and activity in those who are set over him. Yet, conscious of a certain good-tempered slovenliness, he owns the necessity for intelligent and untiring supervision. He is remarkably like the Irish in every way, from his peculiar vein of humour to his lazy dependence on a stronger will; yes, and to the unruly carelessness in which he luxuriates if that extraneous power is absent. And what the negro labourer is individually, the black people of the West Indies are as a political whole. When Mr. Froude demands for them a strong and consistent government he vibrates a chord which should wake the sleeper in Downing Street.

In only one of the books before us is there any prominent mention of the coloured race. Mr. Powles alone seems conscious that there is a class intermediate between the black and the white, which might have in itself the potentiality of greatness. The coloured class shade off by insensible gradations on either side into the black or the white. But, except on the extreme edges of the dividing belt, they are distinct from either. Some of the richest, the cleverest, and the most influential men in the West Indies are gentlemen of colour. Yet a social line, as Mr. Powles shows, separates them from the ruling whites. There is a certain West Indian Governor who treats all men alike with affability and frankness. Whether it was last year we will not say, or whether it was two years back we will not say. Such a one caught a man up into the seventh heaven: that is to say, he invited a well-known coloured citizen to his first party at Government House. He noticed that every one shunned this person, treating him almost with positive rudeness; the Governor found no fault alleged but that he was a coloured man. So the Governor's lady showed the neglected visitor special attention; and the next day his Colonial Secretary and Attorney-General came up to Government House to expostulate about this interference with the social order of the colony. The Governor, however, read them a practical lesson on the folly of making enemies of the most influential party leaders in the islands. This Governor's action may well be followed generally; the coloured people, so far as we have observed, are peculiarly sensitive, and their enmity is undying and intense; they are too readily inclined to envy and hate the white man, especially the creole, and there is a necessity for feeding this morbid sentiment.

The origin of an exclusive feeling in the white breast is sufficiently intelligible; the hatred which the blacks bear to the coloured race is further to seek; but there are few who know the West Indies well

who do not bear witness to its intensity. It is this which must prevent the coloured men from ever rising to be the ruling power in the West Indies. The black will suffer them as long as he perceives the British Government in the background; more than this, he appears to follow readily the coloured agitator, and plays into his hands wherever he has yet been presented with a vote; but even this is often traceable to a certain shrewdness, which induces the belief that the agitator is a tool which may work out the black man's ends. When a writer on the political or social problems of the West Indies ignores the coloured section of the community he is justified so far as he looks mainly to the distant future. To the practical statesman of to-day the coloured people are a force to be gauged and directed.

Nor must we forget the Indian coolie of Trinidad and British Guiana. Mr. Salmon has omitted to discuss the possible relations of the West Indian descendants of Africans and Hindus; but then Mr. Salmon has not been to Trinidad or British Guiana. In those two colonies the Hindu is the mainspring of prosperity; slowly but steadily he is growing, as in the Mauritius, to be the living political power as well. Intellectually there is no question of his superiority over the negro; it has taken some time in Trinidad to get the coolie children to school; but the task is done now, and they outshine not only their black neighbours, but the majority of children in our public elementary schools at home. Commercially there is no comparison between the Hindu immigrant and the negro. If the former has served his indentured time and receives the grant of land which may be given as an alternative of a return passage to India, he will soon relinquish it and take to a shop. None the less is he good at cultivation; the negro is better in the cane-field, because of his greater physical strength; but for cocoa, coffee or the nicer forms of agriculture the negro comes nowhere near the Hindu, and, where the shopkeeping is overdone, the latter competes successfully with the negro peasant proprietor. Further, the Hindu is self-contained, patient, and of considerable vitality; the West Indies suit him, and he is likely to spread largely over them. He is, moreover, exclusive: the black man will marry a coolie woman if he can get her; the coolie man will never mate with the negress. The Hindu race in the West Indies is a force hardly less powerful than the negro—a force which for many years to come would clash with its rival—which Mr. Salmon in his schemes for the future government of the colonies has utterly failed to take into account.

It is the presence of so many conflicting elements which would make the gift of even partial self-government to Trinidad or to British Guiana so mischievous. The experiment has been recently tried in Jamaica. None of the West Indian colonies was so well adapted for the attempt; there is a fairly large number of men, either white or coloured, who are well fitted to take part in the deliberations of any

assembly ; there is a large homogeneous black population, of increasing intelligence, swayed by a uniform idea. Contemporaneously with the establishment of a partially elective Council, there were brought into existence elective parochial boards ; the people of Jamaica were to be educated in all the privileges of freedom ; a new era was to commence. Had we been asked four years ago whether we had approved the new departure we should have said without hesitation — Yes. The late Sir Henry Taylor did not agree with us ; he pronounced it foredoomed to failure ; and he had studied West Indian affairs as few others had done. And what is the result to day ? Are the best men in the island on the Council ? Notoriously not ; they are begging for Crown Colony Government back again. Does the Council represent any unity of purpose or singleness of motive ? Hardly ; when the most respected of its members says in scorn that he cannot answer for its sentiments from one day's end to another. Has the Council carried any great reform in the State ? It had to confess with chagrin that hardly a hole could be picked in the recent administration. Are the elective parish boards educating the people for a wider enjoyment of political rights ? Their quarrelling and corruption are becoming a scandal in every parish. The men who might do good work and set a high tone in the parish or the island Council are men who give their whole time to their estates. There are one or two such men in the island Council just now, but it has become notorious that after the next election it will see them no more ; the representatives of the black man are to be either lawyers or needy agitators ; and what the black man says in effect is this : " Go up to Kingston and talk if you like ; only leave me alone and do not bother me to vote." We need not condemn the experiment utterly as yet ; we can wait and see the lives of three or four fresh Councils ; peradventure a good thing will yet come out of Galilee.

It was not, however, a mere fad of Mr. Gladstone's that inflicted this Council on Jamaica. The men to blame are those very white gentlemen whom Mr. Froude by turns extols and laments over. They never wanted the new government, they never trusted it ; but they did not say so. Petitions went home in favour of it ; they could have got up ten petitions against it for every one that was for it ; but they did not stir. Are they not justly punished for their supineness ?

Still this is no reason for allowing judgment to go similarly by default in Trinidad. The mischief would be still greater there. Apart from the fact that Hindus forms one-fourth of the total population, there is the treble society composed of the English, French, and Spanish-speaking peoples. How will the interests of each be protected ? And if the Venezuelan refugee be admitted to political power, what is the safeguard for the neutrality of the colony ? When the heterogeneous mass begins to blend, and when

the blend has acquired a tolerable knowledge of its own objects and its own needs, her Majesty's Government may fairly consider whether a change of constitution may be then desirable. At present we are justified in inquiring—Who commenced this agitation, and who support it? And we find that that it is the work of a newspaper editor and a provincial mayor, and that not one single person of repute or position supports it, while the coolie and the negro do not know what it is about. "The official appointments were valuable and had hitherto been given away by the Crown. The local popularities very naturally wished to have them for themselves. This was the reality in the thing so far as there was a reality."

Ex uno disce omnes. If Mr. Salmon would spend as many years in the West Indies as we understand he spent months in one of the islands, he would, perhaps, begin to educate the African to understand what a vote is and how it should be used. At present men with more intimate knowledge than Mr. Salmon of the West Indian African assure us that he does not care about a vote, does not use it when he gets it, and, when he signs a petition for the franchise, is persuaded, as recently appeared in evidence before the Trinidad Franchise Commission, either that the petition is against the restoration of slavery, or that it will culminate in the making of a new road past his cabin door.

The fact is that, whether we look at the question from the side of the few white residents, or from the side of the many black natives, a firm Crown Colony Government, wisely administered by men of competence and tact, is the only one under which, regarding the West Indies as a whole, we can safely predict progress and prosperity. Mr. Salmon would of course cite Barbados to the contrary; and we do not yield to Mr. Salmon in our admiration for that brave little community, which stands like a sentinel on the outskirts of the West Indies, has never changed hands, except as between Cavaliers and Roundheads, and largely reproduces to-day the society and institutions of an England. But Barbados is no real illustration of Mr. Salmon's text; rather, to one "who knows," it is strong for the opposite view. The English of Barbados are very jealous of their constitution; and, on the whole, they manage so well, that one is tempted to exclude them from any general scheme for a consolidation of West Indian government. But they do not feel safe, neither do they trust their large black population. "Remember," they commonly say, "that we in Barbados live on the edge of a volcano." Not a pleasant, and in our opinion an exaggerated, idea; but it is used as a conclusive argument against anything like tampering with their present restricted constitution. And as regards any great widening of the franchise, we agree with them; but there is a vast amount of neglect or corruption in dealing with the subject population, which a wiser government would remove before it sowed the seeds of a great

future trouble. Even the very identification of himself with his own island, which is the conspicuous characteristic of the Barbadian negro, is no guarantee of attachment to the existing *régime*. Nor is it altogether encouraging that the overflow of the Barbadian population supplies the criminal classes of the neighbouring colonies. In any case, assuming that Barbados is individually satisfactory, its history has been peculiar, its circumstances are essentially different, and it is no precedent for the government of the neighbouring islands. In these cases the superficial appearances must be neglected; the inquirer must have local knowledge of all the islands.

The term "Crown Colony" is unfamiliar to the general public at home. When, a short time back, there was talk about governing Ireland like a Crown Colony, the inquiries as to the meaning of the term were numerous. The West Indian and the Eastern and Mediterranean colonies are the chief of England's Crown Colonies. In the Crown Colony proper, not only are the governor and all officers of the government appointed by the Crown; but all legislation is conducted by a council nominated entirely by the Sovereign. This council may be composed partly of officials, partly of persons who hold no office under the Government; usually the two classes of members are equally divided: the unofficials are, of course, free to vote as they please on any Bill or resolution; the official members may be required to vote solid for any government measure; and the governor, who is president of the council, has a casting vote. Thus complete control by the Crown is assured. In addition to this, there is the Executive Council of the governor, composed, almost without exception, of the chief officers of the government; it deliberates and advises upon all questions before they go before the larger body, so that a great deal of the real action of government comes to be vested entirely in the governor and his three or four chief officers. In all matters the ultimate decision rests with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, either by way of ordinary reference or an appeal. The system is very much the same as that under which India is governed, so that when Mr. Froude demands the application of the Indian system, he is asking for what is already the rule in most of the West Indies.

This form of government is plainly a despotism. In colonies gained by conquest or cession it has usually been applied from the first. In many of the West India islands the old representative constitution declined with the vigour of their English settlers, and when antagonism to the black inhabitants was combined with personal incapacity for affairs, the intervention of the Crown anticipated degradation and social revolution. Instead of the reign of narrow prejudice and selfish interest, Crown government should bring the blessings of dispassionate judgment, breadth of view, and matured wisdom. Even a little hard-and-fast red-tape is in the long run

better than petty local jobbery. The weakness of the whole system lies in its dependence on men. Here, again, we join issue entirely with Mr. Salmon, who finds the redeeming feature of the government of the Colonial Office in the men whom it has sent out to the West Indies. For, though the heads of departments are, as a rule, well chosen, and many would do credit to any position at home or abroad, yet the same cannot be said of the governors; the people and press of the West Indies are thoroughly justified in declaring that they have too often been saddled with most mediocre governors. There are and have been remarkable exceptions—men who have not always been appreciated, either in their governments or at home. The rule seems to be in favour of untried and unwarranted commodities; as Earl Grey recognized, although he gave a questionable reason for the fact.

The governor of a Crown colony should be a man of somewhat uncommon qualities. A much inferior man will often be a capital governor in the self-governing colonies, where rank, wealth, and tact are the chief qualifications for success. In a colony under the immediate control of the Crown, the governor is not only responsible for everything, but himself the motive power in everything: he is the administration; and the government will be what he makes it. He should, therefore, be a man of mind and of head; thoughtful and clear sighted; possessing judgment and tact; ready to take advice, but capable of acting on his own mature opinion; gracious and kindly in his manner, active and energetic in habit. He should have the art of attaching his officers one and all to himself; he should be ever ready to consult his unofficial advisers, and let them feel that their advice is always valued and always well-weighed; he should never shut himself up in one place, but constantly let his personal interest in the welfare of the colony be before the eyes of the inhabitants.

With such men we should hear the last of complaints against Crown Colony Government. Such a man is not always easy to get; but if the men selected combined as many of these qualities as possible, instead of as few, the West India colonies would not be always crying out to Government to help them, and always blaming the Government when it tried to assist. It is but fair to say that the shortcomings of the colonial governors are seldom chargeable to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The root of the abuse lies in party government and party necessities. How many governors get a place because they are obnoxious, or because they have done some political service? How many are smuggled in as the relations or friends of some leader whom the party delights to honour? *Experimentum in corpore vili.* Perhaps some day we shall understand that our colonies are a great and precious part of ourselves.

The difficulty of getting such men as we have described for each one of several small islands is quickly apparent. And men with totally different views upon the West Indian problems unite in asking the question—Can we not lessen this waste of force by some approach to union? This was Lord Carnarvon's idea when he obtained the formation of the Federal Government of the Leeward Islands, and placed a similar scheme before the Legislature of recalcitrant Barbados. This conception brought about the union of Nevis with St. Kitts, and is projecting the annexation of Tobago to Trinidad; the same opinion pervades the reports of two Commissioners who were sent to the West Indies some five years ago; and Mr. Salmon has made himself already the champion and mouthpiece of the idea of a United West Indies.

The picture he draws of a Caribbean Confederation is intensely attractive. The big colony, stretching in a semicircle from the Bay of Honduras to the Spanish Main; its high-road, the blue Caribbean, instead of the road of iron; the big steamers calling daily from island to island; the active Governor-General on progress from one place to another; the subordinate officers everywhere enthusiastically performing his will; the General Assembly meeting annually for the reality of deliberation—it is a picture which may well stir the pulse of every one who knows the West Indies. O Son of Man! can these dry bones indeed so live?

Foremost amongst the difficulties to be overcome stand the local jealousies of the different colonies. In the smaller islands particularly these reach an intensity which it is difficult for a stranger to conceive. It is the standing grievance of St. Kitts people that Antigua is the head of the Leewards Federation. Antigua would revolt from the Federal Government rather than see the seat of government at Basseterre. It took years of consideration before the people of Nevis would decline to magnify the three miles of sea which separate them from St. Kitts. St. Vincent could not hear of union with its neighbours unless the residence of the common Governor was fixed at Kingstown. The feeling is born of the local history. Each island a century ago had a prosperity and an importance far transcending the lot of any other equal number of square miles. Each island was a unit around which alone a contest might rage. Some had been almost wholly English, some had been little else but French. Such sense of individuality is difficult to uproot. It is perhaps going slowly now. Even Barbados has had a lesson in the advantages of combination. Four years ago Barbados was the seat of the government of the Windward Islands. It petitioned for a governor of its own, who should not have his attention preoccupied by the petty affairs of other islands. Now that the request has been granted, the loss of importance is felt; and it is an open secret that the people of Barbados once more long to be the head of a loose confederation.

But then it is true they desire the headship, and that is different from being a unit in a great combination.

The stumbling-block of local pettiness must be rolled laboriously away. It is useless to concoct a paper confederation, which is viewed with suspicion and dislike by those who alone can make it a success. We must first have the germs of a more vigorous commercial life. There must be the beginning of an influx of new blood from England. When the sense of fresh possibilities is once fairly awakened, the consciousness of isolation will soon become insupportable, the strength of combination will be apparent. Then will be the time for the Home Government to step in, with a proposition that can command the respect and enlist the confidence of all classes alike.

Closely connected with the general inter-insular jealousy just described is the prevalent distrust of a Common Treasury. Not only islands, but districts in the West Indies are constantly subject to the apprehension that taxes raised in any one locality will be spent for the benefit of some other district. This, if we remember aright, was the great bugbear of the schemes of union propounded by Royal Commissioners in 1884 for the Windward and Leeward Islands: the suggestion of a common revenue administered in a single department for the whole colony gave rise to the assertions, on the one hand, that the richer colonies would merely be providing ways and means for their bankrupt neighbours—on the other, that taxes would be raised in the remoter corners or islands of the colony which would be squandered at and on the seat of government. The consciousness that common effort is the mainspring of national progress, that the prosperity of the whole is inseparably bound up with the prosperity of its units, has not yet awakened in the mind of the West Indies.

Thirdly, the personal interests of many inhabitants of each island are all against the change. Local executive and legislative councils are not difficult of access to a foremost man in a small place. The appointments confer prestige, and sometimes power, as well as in some cases the local rank of "Honourable." In all the smaller islands there is a number of small posts paid by low salaries: economy is not the real object of these; in fact, they are quite otherwise than economical; but local families are aware that the pay is too small to attract candidates from outside, and they are accordingly a gift to these families, some of whom will strive to absorb two or three such posts at one time by means of different members. As the holders can live with their friends at the common home these little posts come to be a means of adding to the incomes of certain of the heads of families in the island.

The objection which each colony may be expected to manifest at first to giving up its local legislature will be much intensified in the case of Barbados, which certainly has some reason to be proud of its

House of Assembly. Humility is not a Barbadian virtue, nor is reasonableness one of the Barbadian strong points; the obstinacy and bump-tiousness of the Briton usually expand in a new climate. We are so impressed with the difficulty of convincing the good Barbadians that any good thing can come out of Nazareth that we do not look to see them join in a United West Indies at first. When it became a success they would be perforce absorbed: a small community could not long withstand the attraction of a vigorous and growing power, with a cognate origin and like interest, daily outstripping and overshadowing it, as a well-knit confederation would be sure to do.

The other difficulty in the way of union depends in part on all that has just been referred to. It arises from the traditions of the Colonial Office. It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a Government Department to turn from the beaten track. There is far greater anxiety and determination nowadays than heretofore in all departments of State to do well and thoroughly all that lies before them: but they have not yet got over their timidity of innovation; they are next to incapable of striking out a new and bold line; they will tinker here and there, they will make an improvement in one direction, they will alter a set of rules in another. When there is great pressure from without they will sometimes take a new departure. So, with the Colonial Office, the initiation of a new scheme would probably have to come from outside. The Department is too likely to wait till a desire, a restlessness, begins to manifest itself in the West Indies, instead of leading up to, and continually encouraging or educating, the conviction of the benefits of union.

Yet even now something may be done, and the Colonial Office may help in this. Let the lesson of complete union be taught by experience of union in smaller combinations. Let not the idea of a united Leeward Islands or a united Windward Islands be finally abandoned. It was put forward and discussed a few years back, but in a half-hearted and academical manner. The Commissioners' reports, out of which it arose, were wanting in life and penetration, and the proposals founded on them could not but partake of the same faults. They fell to the ground in 1885, but some such schemes might be carried with acclamation in 1891. A union of the Windward Islands and a united Leeward Islands would readily grow into a united colony, including all the lesser Antilles; and from this there would be no great step to union of all the West Indies.

It is perhaps the vital part of the whole question which we approach when we inquire whether the Government of the enlarged colony should be of what Mr. Froude calls the Indian pattern, or an improved reproduction of the Barbados Government, based upon an elective Assembly. The latter would facilitate the adhesion of Barbados: and it is the form which Mr. Salmon assigns and describes. Here, again, we come back to considerations already referred to:

if the new colony were erected within a few years while yet the negro was uneducated, while the Hindu was still comparatively fresh from his home in the East, then there can be no doubt that the best form of government would be that of the Crown, pure and simple, with its legislature composed partly of heads of departments, and partly of unofficial members nominated with care and judgment. Such a Government, continually exposed to the light of a fairly wide and influential public opinion, might for some generations conduct the affairs of the West Indies with entire credit and success, until it had educated all classes under its rule to a true and deep sense of their mutual responsibilities and complete inter-dependence. Then, by gradual changes, it could hand over the full responsibility for legislation to a worthy and intelligent people, amongst whom the negroes would have the full influence which their preponderating number might give them, but without the ignorance and excitability which would now make them a danger to such a State, Mr. Salmon to the contrary notwithstanding.

At the same time, directly we pass from the petty interests and local rivalries of single small islands to an extensive combination of many islands many of the objections to an elective Assembly disappear, so long as the franchise is not made too low. If Crown Colony Government be the best solution, Mr. Salmon's Assembly would be a respectable alternative. A few really intelligent men, white, coloured, or sometimes black, would usually be available to represent each island: if the members of the Assembly were fewer than is proposed the chances of getting a higher level of intelligence in the members would be proportionately increased. The dangers of agitators and of local jobbery would be minimized, because the interests of one part of the colony would be balanced in the Assembly against the interests of another, and any tendency to corruption in one quarter would be corrected by the independence of other representatives. A fairly powerful government would thus be obtained; but we are of opinion that for very many years to come it would be a government by the white inhabitants of the colonies, and not the purely negro domination which Mr. Salmon demands and Mr. Froude abjures.

In many cases there would certainly be a local council in each of the present colonies to deal with purely local matters, in constitution not unlike their present legislature, in duties akin to a town council or parish board.

Beside the endeavour to familiarize the colonies with the idea of combination by encouraging the union of smaller groups, there is one thing the British Government may fairly obtain by persistence, which would have a most important effect on the commerce of the West Indies. The tariffs of customs, the harbour dues, the light dues—all the imposts which affect shipping and commerce—vary for

each different colony and island; they have become uncertain through frequent changes, and are objectionable in many points of their incidence. Uniformity of tariffs and shipping dues would give an immense stimulus to commercial life: it would save much time and expense, and simplify transactions amazingly, if traders could once know that in every part of the West Indies they would meet the same conditions and the same trade regulations. Further, if dues on shipping are retained, they should be so levied as not to discourage vessels from calling at island after island in hopes of a cargo. It is too common a complaint at the present time that ships are frightened away by the heavy expense to which they have been subjected when merely seeking freight.

The principle of the customs tariffs in all the islands is capable of great improvement. We are at one with Mr. Salmon when he condemns the heavy duties on foods, and recommends a reform of the incidence of taxation. This question has long been one of the problems of West Indian Governments. It was earnestly canvassed during Earl Grey's administration. A few years back, under Lord Kimberley, it excited considerable attention in some of the islands. The main current of feeling in these colonies is dead against the reform; but the arguments against the abolition of food duties usually land themselves in the dilemma that it is idle to take off the taxes, because the negro is not thereby benefited, and that it is necessary to keep them on, because this is the only way of making the negro contribute to the revenue. The only persons who can speciously maintain such a *reductio ad absurdum* are those who argue that the reduction or abolition of a duty will not in any case be followed by a fall of price. Such evidence as we have been able to glean from the Report of the Commissioners of 1883-4, and the evidence attached to it, is all against that argument. Competition is said to be keen even in the West Indies, and we may therefore be pardoned for asserting that, in spite of all protestations to the contrary, it may be taken as certain that here, as elsewhere, reduction of duty will ultimately result in a fall of price. The right view of the question has been somewhat obscured by the extreme statements of two opposing parties. In ordinary years and times of plenty wheaten bread and meal are not, as yet at any rate, necessaries of life to the labouring population of the West Indies, where plantains and yams, manioc and eddoes spring up quickly and abundantly. It is in the times of sudden drought, when the supply of native products fails, that the limited stock of imported foods is forced up to famine price and a real injury done to the labourer. A short time ago the neighbouring Republic of Venezuela was visited by a great drought, and was compelled for a time to remove its prohibitive import duties on food-stuffs that the people might have a chance of escape from starvation. This is precisely the case for which it is sought by the wiser West Indian statesmen to legislate

in due time. Moreover, as the population of these colonies grows, the necessity for removing all restrictions on the supply of food becomes yearly more pressing : already an increasing number of the more intelligent members of the coloured labouring class have got firmly hold of the idea that to tax their food is unjust. As a rule the black man, crying out against the "oppressions of the taxes," names as his cause of offence the licence for his stallion, his dog, or his hovel. The better educated labourers are now becoming conscious of a more real grievance, which they share with the minister, the clerk, and the "mean" whites.

The reform of taxation and the improvement of finance are ends which the Government, even under present conditions, has largely within its own control. The Colonial Office has shown no lack of appreciation of this fact. Whatever steps have been taken in the right direction have been the efforts of this Department of State, or its governors. It has clearly laid down and supported the principles of a reformed tariff, but it has been opposed by a vast mass of ignorance and prejudice. The main work is still to be done, and it may be done without waiting for new and large schemes of Government ; not by a single blow, perhaps, but by the unflinching maintenance of the policy already adopted, by giving each change of taxation a turn in the right direction, by urging in season and out of season the wisdom of the reform.

This is one thing which the Government of Great Britain may do for the West India colonies. It cannot do everything, nor can it fairly be charged with half the failures and disappointments which both Mr. Froude and Mr. Salmon seek to fasten on it. The acquired inertia of the West India settler has led him to expect too much from the Government, and he blames it accordingly when things go wrong. This is the secret of half the abuse of Crown Colony Government. State-aid will for some years to come play a prominent part in West Indian enterprise ; energy has fallen so low, that a strong helping-hand is necessary. But fresh blood and fresh capital, new industries, and new means of communication are the necessary material for the Government to work upon ; and happy are the West Indies that the growing determination to develop the trade in spices, fruits, or tobacco is leading on a new era in their history.

The Director of the Royal Gardens at Kew was the first to insist that the West Indian colonies were adapted for other cultivation besides sugar, and that much of their future prosperity depended on the promptitude with which this was recognized, and the trial of new products initiated. It is not generally known how thoroughly imperial is the work of Kew, how the department recognizes a duty towards the colonies, and performs it with a zeal and tenacity which public departments are slow to exhibit. Mr. Morris is only carrying out in this country the work which he began as Director of the

Botanic Gardens in Jamaica. The example of his success in that island stimulated most of the other West India Governments to tread the same path, and Kew is now in touch with a small local department in nearly all the islands. The organization is not yet complete ; in a short time we may expect not only to see a botanical garden and staff recognized as a necessary portion of each colony's equipment, but to find all smoothly working on the same lines for the same ends, guided by one of the departments, most probably that at Jamaica, as consultative and distributing centre, under the general supervision of Kew. In the Botanic Gardens new plants and new varieties are reared, their relation to local circumstances is investigated, their commercial value is tested ; seedlings and suckers, young plants of all kinds are kept constantly in stock, and periodically are distributed to the cultivators who wish to renew plantations or establish new industries. Each colony will have in its garden the nucleus of an agricultural department, and the common organization of the gardens will assure to each planter in the West Indies the best possible advice on the care and treatment of his produce.

It is not every industry that will suit each island. The West Indian is too apt to conclude that what his neighbour can do is suitable also for himself. All the islands, for instance, look for great benefits from the opening of the Panama Canal. This is just one of the straws at which the West Indian is too inclined to catch. If and when the Canal is opened but one or two islands at most will gain from this cause any great accession of prosperity and importance : these islands will probably be Jamaica and St. Lucia. It is just as well for the others to sweep away the hallucination which tempts them still to wait on Providence. Similarly it is desirable to face the fact that the islands continually differ in their natural capacities ; it is a strong argument for the presence of a technical adviser, who can pronounce at once on the suitability of any product to a particular island, or can judge of the value of the experiments which enterprising planters may see fit to undertake.

Jamaica stands alone of the British islands, with a remarkable variety of soil, climate, and configuration, which adapt it equally well to the growth of every kind of tropical produce. It still gives us the richest coffee and the choicest rum that reach the London market ; and it has been hitherto the finest grazing country in the Western tropics. It required a high price to make sugar pay in the Virgin Islands ; cotton comes into competition with that of American growth, and the fibre-aloe is left for the present as the most hopeful resource of these bare and uncared-for islets. Antigua, St. Christopher, and Nevis have been denuded of their forests and devoted to sugar. Along with Barbados they are now essentially colonies for the large proprietor. There is room for certain secondary products, such as onions and tomatoes, as well as ground provisions

for the labourers ; but they will do well to stand fast by the sugar, which has become their staple. In Montserrat the Sturges have made a name for the island and its lime-juice ; and what has been done with the lime may be done with other industries. On the north the island is more like Dominica and the Windwards, than it is like the neighbouring Leeward Islands. Dominica, for varied capacity and luxuriant fertility, is equalled only by Jamaica ; its mountains and valleys are so constant and sharply cut that sugar should take but a secondary place in its industries ; as regards all others it is an unopened gold mine. All the Windward Islands have a similar varied capacity, and Grenada is an example of prosperity without sugar. In Trinidad sugar and cocoa will increase side by side ; tobacco is getting some hold ; the " minor industries " are being eagerly pushed ; the island will yield to none in the result of any industry which does not require grazing lands, considerable elevations, or an air cooler than the common. At each end of the sweep of the Antilles lies an exceeding fertile piece of continent, almost unexplored except on the coast. In both British Honduras and British Guiana the forests will yield their profit before the clearings compete with the richest produce of the islands. British Honduras already supplies the market of New Orleans with its fruit. The interior savannahs of British Guiana will one day show the finest pastures in the West Indies ; while even now at any moment El Dorado may be realized within its bounds. To the north there is a stir throughout the Bahamas, for they find themselves the possessors of a fibre plant which bids fair to solve the question what to export from these scrub-covered islets, besides the fruit, which is sent to New York, and the sponges, which deserve to be better known in Europe.

Sugar and rum will always remain the great industry of the West Indies. There has been a tendency of late years in some quarters to talk of the industry as moribund, to run down the efforts of the planters, and to gibe at the influence of Billiter House. Doubtless the day of competition has come, and even Baron de Worms's Convention cannot greatly raise the price of sugar. Brazil, on the one side, and Guatemala and Costa Rica on the other, will maintain a rivalry sufficiently severe. But the low shores of British Guiana, that stretch of alluvial land in Trinidad which fronts on the Gulf of Paria, the carefully cultivated soil of Barbados, and other islands and parts of islands all through the British West Indies, will always produce sugar as cheaply as any part of the world. And sugar has become such a staple of consumption, with so apparently unlimited a demand, that the importance of the industry cannot be superseded.

We question whether cocoa (cacao we prefer to call it) will, in the long run, find the demand commensurate with the efforts which are being made to supply it. The success of the two best

cacao-growing colonies, Trinidad and Grenada, has been so great that every one is now rushing into cacao planting, in the hope of picking up a share in the profits. Unless the demand for cocoa is much stronger than at present appears, there will be a danger of disappointment in many quarters within a very few years.

This was much the case with cinchona: the price was high and the profit on paper seemed certain. But people cannot take quinine as they take tea, and the success of the Jamaica plantations was the signal for a fall in price which has knocked cinchona for ever off the list of staples, however useful it may be as a secondary and occasional product.

Coffee has been subject to such great variations in the market that people have seemed to fight shy of it: but a little perseverance might give the West Indies the entire supply of the English market, in addition to the local demand, which is very considerable. Good tea is second only to sugar in the certainty of unceasing popularity: its price is still high, even considering the expensive machinery required for curing; and Ceylon is an example of what energy can do with a new product.

Spices command a high price, and there is only one West India island which makes an industry of their growth as yet. But caution is necessary in increasing the area of their cultivation: it is once more a question of the capacity of the demand.

So with limes, ginger, sarsaparilla, and many other products. Yet all of these have their possibilities of development; and there are untried products, such as coca and the kola-nut, which may one day form a prosperous industry.

Tobacco has to overcome the difficulties of curing and the prejudice in favour of Havannah cigars. A short time back the Jamaica cigar bid fair to make its way in popular favour; but there came a change of management in the estate where the plant was chiefly grown: they first spoiled the crops by bad manuring, and then ruined their reputation by passing off as the old brand cigars made with bad material. So tobacco in the British West Indies has gone back to the very beginning—if anything, with a fresh prejudice against it. This, however, can be overcome in time, and meanwhile the local market is open to the grower at a very handsome profit on his capital.

The fruit trade with the United States has shown a wonderful capacity for development; yet over and again the fruit is shipped almost as badly as it is possible to put it on board. There are no pains taken to sort it; small and large, ripe and unripe, are squashed in together; there is no intelligent connection between the shipper and the grower: the one gives as little as he can, and the other counts success by the number of packages. Further, there are no pains taken in gathering the fruit: pine apples are torn off at the

stalk, oranges are shaken to the ground. Nor are the trees tended, manured, or pruned.

There is a great field for intelligent young Englishmen, with a few hundred pounds at command, who are willing to make their home in the West Indies. "There are dollars" in any of the islands, as well as Jamaica; and in most of them there are Crown lands to be purchased, or abandoned estates to be picked up, at a very low price. But the first condition of success is the intention to make a home there for at least a long period of years; if for life, so much the better. If we can induce a stream of Englishmen of the right stamp to settle once more in the West Indies, and gather around them home relations and interests, to take a deep concern in the welfare of their adopted country, and to be ambitious eventually to take their share in its government, the benefit will be great both to England and her colonies, and we shall hear no more of the forebodings of Mr. Froude and Mr. Paton, for there will be a race of men to whom the negro will look up, even as he grows yearly more educated and intelligent—a race of men who will repeat and surpass the example of Barbados in independence and self-reliance.

And what home can be pleasanter than that which the West India islands offer? Did not Englishmen live there and thrive in palmier days? Can we never again see the portly planter, in his broad-brimmed straw and cool white coat? Yea, the history of the West Indies may commence yet anew. The climate is charming, except in some parts and at certain seasons. On the high grounds there is no fault to find: the sea-breezes invigorate hourly; the scenery is often lovely in the extreme; the blue Caribbean is never far off; the natives are pleasant and kindly. The unhealthiness of these colonies is a myth: there are low-lying and uncleared portions which harbour malaria, and supineness or carelessness expose the health to an unfair strain at times. There is a disease called yellow fever, which is sometimes epidemic; and intermittent fever is common. But carelessness is the cause of too many deaths in this country, and small-pox and consumption are more common and deadly than the fevers of the tropics. If the site for the home be well chosen, there is no reason why the settler should not see the West Indies with the same eyes as the holiday-maker, who passes down the islands to find each more beautiful than the last, with the sun ever sparkling on the blue Caribbean around the deep-embowered homes of the kindest and most hospitable of Britons. It is the province of the mother-country to encourage such settlements; they bless both her that gives and her that takes: men who might have been crushed out of existence in the struggling crowd of the old country can become leading citizens in the ample space and air-room of the Caribbean Islands; men who would only have added to the volume of discontent and retrogression here may become the exam-

ples and leaders of a black race who are proud to imitate them. It is worth our while so to plan and advise that we may attach to ourselves by that simple action a new and vigorous colony, with traditions of glory and splendour beyond any possessions of the Crown.

England has not quite yet cast away the worn-out toy, and if she ever had it in her mind, which we deny, she is learning to cling more affectionately than before to her oldest colonies. And they are worthy of it. What the American writer says is quite true. Even in the midst of the bitter disappointment caused by the loss of a commercial treaty with the States in 1885, the real loyalty of the colonists did not waver. There were a few men who talked bitterly of going to the States; the malcontents in Dominica even introduced into council some resolution to that effect. But the talk was all in temper: it was not seriously meant; and there are very few men in the West Indies now who would contemplate with complacency any change of their political connection. We have always had great doubts whether our friends in the United States have any great longing for the possession of these islands: Mr. Paton seems to us to put their feeling very well. But we should never permit the shadow of a misunderstanding to arise between us and that great land which was once an English colony, and is destined perhaps one day to become more than our equal. A thoroughly friendly understanding as to certain of the West Indies which are not now under British rule will be very desirable. Cuba, Hayti, Porto Rico, and the Danish islands are all more or less likely to come into question before many years are over. The Danish Government might at any time prefer to part with somewhat unprofitable possessions, which are largely English in sentiment and proprietorship; and it is very desirable that Great Britain should be prepared to meet the wishes of Denmark rather than let the remainder of the Virgin Islands pass into strange hands. Spain is not successful in its management of Cuba and Porto Rico, the former of which is pretty much her own mistress. But Cuba is largely kept going by American capital, and it is the one island which, if it goes anywhere, will go to the States; we do not think the Government of Washington would contemplate with acquiescence its absorption by any State but their own. As regards Hayti, the position is different: we cannot avoid the opinion that we shall be called upon, partly through our premier position in the West Indies, partly by arrangement with the United States, to hoist the Union Jack one day at Jeremie and Samana. We need not shirk the responsibility if it comes; rather we should prepare for it by exhibiting that firm, just rule in a united West Indies, under which the black man can prosper and grow wise. There would be some anxiety and trouble at first, but nothing more; and the fertility, wealth, and beauty of San Domingo would be a great acquisition, and would round off the British territory in that part of the world.

It is unfortunate that we cannot possess the whole circle of the Antilles, for experience has shown that the Briton gets on best when he is not rubbing elbows with his neighbours. But two such miniatures of the mother-country as are Martinique and Guadeloupe would not easily become satisfactory adjuncts of the British Empire, even were it possible to conceive of France relinquishing colonies which she prizes so highly.

But whatever the political connection may be, it is quite clear that the trade of the British West Indies is going more and more to the States. This was evidenced by the negotiations for the admission of West Indian sugar duty-free into the United States markets. And here we may make one observation on the criticisms to which the action of the British Government was subjected in this matter: the breaking off of negotiations did not come from them. They sought the abolition of the duty on sugar exported from the West Indies in exchange for free admission of American food-stuffs into the colonies. So far there was a fair exchange: the Government at Washington offered a reduction of duty on several other articles, but coupled with the whole a clause which, however reasonable, would have interfered seriously with other British treaties. The English Government tried to effect a compromise and get round the clause. The other side did not see their way quite clear; and, meanwhile, there came into power in the States a Government opposed to the policy of commercial treaties; and these and other pending negotiations with different Powers were quietly dropped. Now it seems likely that the Government of the United States may take off their duties upon sugar without any equivalent; and in this case more of the West Indian sugar will find a market in the States.

It is not the case, as it is customary to argue, that the price obtained by West India planters in the United States market is so much better than that obtainable in England. It is unfair to hold up the English market to obloquy as denying to the British planter what the United States freely give. The market for sugar is largely a world's market: and the price does not greatly vary from country to country, putting aside the purely fictitious internal price in the countries which support bounty-fed factories. In 1884, when the great fall in the price of sugar came, the fine sugars of British Guiana abandoned the American market, and came almost entirely to this country. At the present day it pays the planter far better to make fine sugar for £13 a ton, and to sell it here at £17, than to make muscovado at £12 per ton, and sell it at New York for £12 10s.

The close trade intercourse between the West Indies and the United States depends not upon prices, but on proximity; and to attempt to interfere with it would be stupid and useless. The West Indies will always take large supplies of flour, meat, and salted fish;

and it is natural that these should come from the nearest country of origin, and in a less degree from Canada. The United States are large consumers of tropical fruit, and the West Indies are to them ten times more than Madeira and the Azores are to us. On the sugar cargoes freight to the States is so much lower that, particularly with the right of free import, there is every reason why the West Indian produce should tend thither. The reversion of trade to its natural channels seems strange only because the habit of forcing it is so inveterate. At last such efforts have become nugatory. Trade is much more evenly spread through the world than it was fifty years ago, and the recasting tendency is at work everywhere. In the present case much of the change is apparent only. Some years back Barbados appears as the exporting centre to all the other islands. Increase of steam communication has altered this; and what used to be imported through Barbados from the States now appears in the returns as coming directly from the latter. In dry goods and hardware, and many other like commodities, Great Britain retains, and is likely to retain, pre-eminence. The black man is very conservative in such matters. Once he gets his hoe from Birmingham he will always get his hoe from Birmingham. It rests with the English manufacturer to keep up a supply of really sound goods. We need not be afraid of fair competition, and we shall not lose in the long run by a close and friendly commercial relation between our islands and the United States.

It is at first sight somewhat mortifying that the British West Indies should be so much less evidently prosperous than the French islands. From a merely commercial point of view their development is not so very much inferior. It is as homes and permanent resting-places they have hitherto failed. There is less difference between the temperature of Toulon or Madrid and Guadeloupe than there is between London and Trinidad; it is harder for the Englishman to settle in the tropics than for an individual from a southern race. The Frenchman, moreover, has not that abiding sentiment about the "old country" which the English colonist hardly ever loses. For him France is in his home wherever that may be, and so a French colony is a miniature of France; and to go from St. Lucia across to Martinique has exactly the same effect as crossing the Straits of Dover. At the same time the Frenchman who so identifies himself with his colony, retains enough influence at home to identify the colony with France; thus, the French Government spends largely on her colonies, and the latter are protected in her markets. And where the Frenchman's home is, there is neatness and brightness and improving thrift.

Putting aside the question whether we sufficiently cultivate reciprocal trade relations with the colonial portion of our Empire, there is one lesson we can learn from French and Spanish colonists. The

future settlers who choose the West Indies for their fortunes' sake must take them also for a definite home : they will come back to England now and again, and we shall be glad to see them ; but their own prosperity and the interest of Great Britain alike will bind them to the soil of their adopted home. They leave their country for their country's good, but that country is thereby bound more and more to know their wants, to aid their weakness, to deserve their affection.

The bow of Ulysses is yet perhaps unstrung ; but there are men who can go forth once again and bend the mighty weapon. There are still hearts that should leap at the cry of "Westward ho !" The forts are once more crowning the Vigie over Castries Bay ; who can say but yet again the West Indian fleet may save the British Empire ? And though we pray for peace, yet the memory of conquests won in days gone by is a sign to us that there are conquests to be won on other fields in these days of ours—over despondency and negligence, over selfishness and supineness ; and, so long as we can keep such foes from our West India colonies, we need have no great fear for the decadence of the Empire at large.

KING OLAF TRYGGVISSON.

AMONG the pictured windows of the Town Hall of Lerwick, which represent the chief historic figures of the Norse period of the ancient Earldom of Orkney and Shetland, there is one in which a crowned king and queen appear standing side by side ; in the background of the kingly figure, a dog lies at his master's feet—a dog famed in story. The king is Olaf of Norway—first of that name : the queen is his wife Thyri : the dog is King Olaf's hound "Vigi"—a great wolf-hound whom his master got in Ireland when on a war cruise there. And these three, once for a brief space, companions together amid many changes and chances—bound together in the bundle of this brief earthly life, had it also appointed to them that even in death they were not divided.

This King Olaf, generally known as Olaf Tryggvissón, to distinguish him from the other Olaf who lived a generation later, and who is best known as Saint Olaf, or Olaf Haraldsson, was king of Norway in the very end of the tenth century. His reign began in 995, and closed in the year 1000, in a strange and tragic way, whereof much has been written in the old Northern chronicles ; his whole term as king was thus only five years, but they were eventful ones in Norse history, and bore much fruit, not only in the merely local field of the North, but in European politics generally.

Carlyle calls him "a magnificent, far-shining man ;" and again he says : "strangely he remains still a shining figure to us ; the wildly beautifullest man in body and soul that one has ever heard of in the North." While the latest writers and authorities on Northern matters, the editors of the *Corpus Boreale*, recently issued by the Clarendon Press, say :

"The greatest of all the Northern kings, his life is an episode of exceeding interest. Coming out of the darkness, he reigns for five short years, during which he accomplishes his great design, the Christianizing Norway and all her colonies ; and then in the height of his glory, with the halo of holiness and heroism undimmed on his head, he vanishes again. But his works do not perish with him. He had done his work, and though maybe his ideal of a great Christian Empire on the Baltic was unfulfilled, he had single-handed wrought the deepest change that has ever affected Norway. His noble presence brightens the Sagas whenever it appears, like a ray of sunshine gleaming across the dark shadowy depths of a Northern firth. All bear witness to the wonderful charm which his personality exercised over all that were near him, so that like the holy King Lewis (who, however, falls

short of Olaf) he was felt to be an unearthly, superhuman being by those who knew him. His singular beauty, his lofty stature, golden hair and peerless skill in bodily feats, made him the typical Norseman of the old heroic times, a model king."¹

King Olaf Tryggvissón was of the blood-royal of Norway, being great-grandson of King Harald Fairhair, to whose crown, in course of time, he succeeded. Harald Fairhair was the first king of Norway. He took in hand the building up of the country into one realm under one head; the establishing of order and of public law. Before his time, the land was under separate local chiefs or kinglets, each of whom did what was right in his own eyes and wrong in those of his neighbours', and constant civil war was the rule. Harald subjugated them all, forced them to own him as Sovereign head; followed up the Vikings who resisted him across the Western sea to Orkney, Shetland, Farøe; brought these lands under his sway, and settled some form of government in each group of islands. Of the Northern Earldom, the story is told in the Orkney Saga, whence it has been copied into all the subsequent local histories and guide-books, how King Harald gave his friend Rognvald (another William to another Bismarck) the Earldom of Orkney and Shetland, and how from that famous Earl all the Norman dukes and Queen Victoria herself is lineally descended. King Harald died about the year 940, aged eighty-three, leaving Norway one realm but still heathen. Christianity had not yet penetrated into the North. Old King Harald's life-task was the building up of Norway into one State; it was the long task of his children's children to turn it from Norse Paganism to be a Christian land. He himself lived and died heathen.

But even in the old king's times, the sound of the coming change in creed, laws, and customs was heard all over the North. His son Hakon, surnamed the Good, became Christian, and set himself in earnest to root out the old faith and bring in a newer and better; but he had unheard-of difficulties and opposition to encounter, and for generations the new creed seemed to make but little headway. Yet the new was growing, the old decaying steadily all the while, as is the way in this world.

We have a certain difficulty in realizing how it was that our forefathers should have hesitated to receive the Christian faith, or how they cared to cling to the old heathenism. We ourselves are saturated with Christian influences; we are the product of hundreds of years of constantly accumulating Christian tendencies; we see all things through an atmosphere into which we were born, and of which we cannot divest ourselves. The ancient ways of thought of our own race are as strange and foreign to us as if we were of another planet. What in their eyes was lawful and praiseworthy, seems horrible and even incredible to us: their fierce cruelty, their savage customs, their

¹ *Corpus Poeticum Norseale*, vol. ii. 83.

entire ignoring of what we regard as self-evident things—all these strike us as incomprehensible. That only a few hundred years ago our own race should have slain men in cold blood, without pity and without remorse, offered human sacrifice as a customary rite, tortured their prisoners in war, exposed new-born children to perish, and treated their slaves more cruelly than the worst of men now would treat a dog—seems, indeed, strange to us. Not that wicked and cruel things are not done yet every day in Christian lands, but the difference is that *then* they were approved by public conscience and by common law; now they are done against law, and shock conscience.

We have a vivid account of one Parliamentary debate in which King Hakon's new reforming schemes were voted down by the old Conservative constitutional party of the day, which had more than one leader equal to the occasion. This glimpse into a stormy scene of the tenth century is worth taking. It was at a Thing held in the Throndhjem district, that King Hakon made a speech to the people, signifying that now the time was come for the putting away of all heathen customs, and that all Bonder should become Christians, and believe in one God, Christ the Son of Mary—renouncing entirely blood sacrifices and heathen idols; should keep every seventh day holy, abstain from labour that day, devoting it to fasting and sacred meditation. When the king had finished, there arose by way of answer a confused universal murmur of entire dissent. "Take away from us our old belief, and also our time for labour!" they murmured in angry astonishment; "how can even the land be got tilled in that way?" "We cannot work if we don't get food," said the hand labourers and the slaves. "It lies in King Hakon's blood," remarked others; "his father and all his kindred were apt to be stinging about food, though liberal enough with money."

At length, one Osbjörn, of Medalhusin Gulathal, stepped forward and said in a distinct manner:—

"We Bonder thought, King Hakon, when thou heldest thy first Thing-day here in Throndhjem, and we took thee for our king, and received our odal lands from thee again, that we had got heaven itself. But now, we know not how it is, whether we have won freedom, or whether thou intendest anew to make us slaves with this wonderful proposal that we should renounce our faith, which our fathers before us have held, and all our ancestors as well, first in the age of burial by burning, and now in that of earth burial; and yet these departed ones were much our superiors, and their faith too has brought prosperity to us! Thee, at the same time, we have loved so much that we raised thee to manage all the laws of the land and speak as their voice to us all. And even now, it is our will and the vote of all Bonder to keep that pactum which thou gavest us here on the Thing at Froste, and to maintain thee as king so long as any of us Bonder, who are *here upon the Thing, has life left; provided thou, king, wilt go fairly to work, and demand of us only such things as are not impossible. But if thou wilt fix upon this thing with so great obstinacy, and employ force and power, in that case, we Bonder have taken the resolution, all of us, to*

fall away from thee and to take for ourselves another head, who will so behave that we may enjoy in freedom the belief which is agreeable to us. Now shalt thou, king, choose one of these two courses before the Thing disperse."

Whereupon, adds the chronicle, all the Bonder raised a mighty shout : " Yes, we will have it so, as has been said."¹

Thus were King¹ Hakon's proposals met by the staunch old heathen, and for long repulsed. Even when at length Christianity triumphed, and was " brought into the law," as the phrase was ; by an unlucky chance, bad seasons set in over Norway : year after year there was scarcity, even famine, and great murmurings arose. " See what you have brought upon us, with your new-fangled notions," said the folk all over the North ; " the gods whom you rejected have now rejected us, and are punishing us for our wickedness." We can judge how hearty would be the allegiance to the new creed, when such beliefs were common. Although, for form's sake, there was an outward compliance with Christian creed and ritual—doubtless for generations, the old heathen rites were diligently practised and more trusted in than all the observances of the Church. The eating of horseflesh, the Yule customs, the practice of charms and divinations, and the faith in sorcery long survived, deeply rooted in the public consciousness.

As the life-task of King Harald Fairhair was the building up of Norway, so that of King Olaf was the consolidation of it, and, above all, the Christianizing of the whole North. The royal race of Norway produced capable men : they never wanted a man to stand before them. But of them all the greatest was King Olaf. His designs were vast and far-reaching. He planned a great Christian Empire of the North, in which the Baltic was to be a lake, and all Europe was to be brought under its sway. He had dreams which, seven hundred years afterwards, the great Gustav Adolf of Sweden still shared : dreams which led him to be the chief captain of Europe. King Olaf was but a young man when, in his thirty-second year, his brief course ended :

"Short day and long remembrance,"

his appropriate epitaph !

Within the few years of his manhood and reign, great events were crowded, and of him especially, among the heroic figures of the North, it can be said that his memory

" will live alone, as mournful light
That broods above the fallen sun,
And dwells in heaven half the night."

Surely no one of princely birth had a more chequered career, and one so full of rapid incident. Of the kingly race, as has been said, his father, a grandson of Harald Fairhair, was slain in one of those civil broils which were perpetual. His mother Astrid, accompanied by

¹ Carlyle's *Early Kings of Norway*.

her foster-father, Thorolf, had to flee for her life. Three months afterwards she gave birth to a boy, whom she named after her grandfather Olaf: the boy was born on a holm in a lake, where for some months, according to the legend, they lay concealed. Then Astrid made her way to Sweden, and was there two years; thence she journeyed for refuge with her brother Sigurd Erikson in Gardaríke, what we now call Russia; but on the way they were attacked by Vik-ings, who slew the king's foster-father, and sold her and her boy for slaves. Olaf was bought for a "good big goat;" a man from Esthonia bought him next for "a good cloak," and with this man the boy lived six years. His master was kind to him, and loved the child greatly. Already that wonderful personality, which afterwards attracted all who came under its influence, made itself felt. Now, says the Saga, it chanced that Sigurd Erikson came to Esthonia to collect the skat, and one day rode with his men to the gaard where Olaf was. The boy was outside playing with some others, and when he saw the strangers ride into the gaard, he went towards them, as the son of a king should do, and greeted the leader. Sigurd saw at once that the boy was a stranger: he greeted him in return, and asked of his name and race. "I am called Olaf," answered he; "of Norway is my race, and there was I born; my father was King Tryggvi Olafsson, and my mother is Astrid Erik's daughter." Then Sigurd recognized Olaf as his sister's son, bought the boy, and took him to Gardaríke. Olaf was then nine years old.

In Russia he remained and had his training until he was eighteen. The universal voice of Saga and tradition describes him as surpassingly handsome. Tall and powerfully made, golden-haired, beautifully and carefully dressed; skilled in every manly exercise, he could swim, run, skate swifter than any man. His winning manner, his wit and humour, his gifts as a ready and eloquent speaker, all contribute to complete a picture of a leader of men. No doubt the natural tendency to exaggerate the accomplishments of one loved and admired as he was, has to be allowed for; but there can be no doubt of the strange charm which King Olaf's presence seems to have had. "Hardly any king," says Snorro, "was ever so well obeyed; by one class out of zeal and love, by the rest out of dread."

In his eighteenth year he went out into the greater world as a Vik-ing—the then recognized profession of a princely Norseman. He soon showed such qualities of a war-captain, that he drew around him the chosen champions of the North; the Sagas say no such crews were before or since as King Olaf manned his ships with. He cruised all over the coasts of Northern Europe, and along the shores of England, Wales, Ireland, and the Hebrides. Once at the Scilly Isles he rested, and there fell in with some strange Christian monk or hermit whom he had the curiosity to seek out, examine, question and

discourse with. There it is said, Olaf received Christian baptism from this hermit; but the story is involved in mystery and miracle, and the certainty of it not easily attained. Thereafter Olaf made alliance with King Sweyn of Denmark for a joint invasion of England, and for a year or more was engaged in that attempt. In 990, they sailed up the Thames with 300 ships and assaulted London, but the venture failed with great loss to the Danes, and the two kings turned aside and went all over the south of England; Kent, Hampshire, Sussex were ravaged until the English king, Ethelred, bought them off with the yearly tribute known as the Danegelt. Ultimately, Sweyn subdued England and founded the Danish dynasty, which produced a brief term of strict government there. For about two years, Olaf—still not king of Norway—remained in England, in the neighbourhood of Southampton, on terms of friendship with the English king. There he came to know Archbishop Elphege, and at this time a great change came over Olaf. He was publicly baptized, afterwards confirmed by the Archbishop; and departed by the west coast of England and Scotland, tarrying some time at the Danish Court in Dublin, on his way. From this period his work of Christianizing the North began. Now it was that he comes into the Orkney Saga—the history of the ancient Earldom of Orkney and Shetland—as the king who brought in Christianity by the baptizing of Earl Sigurd and the introduction of Christian priests. On his return in 995 to Norway, at Thronhjelm he was chosen king, and his short and memorable reign began. For the five years he ruled his labours were unceasing. Devoted to three great purposes, his life was led: first, the constitutional building up of Norway as one State; second, the putting down of heathenism and the establishment of Christianity; third, the founding of a great Northern Empire, which was to include all Scandinavia and the Baltic lands. He was a statesman as well as a great soldier; he saw and foresaw; he was hundreds of years ahead of his time. But although he succeeded in carrying out two of his lofty purposes, the fulfilment of the three was denied him. The forces of his day were against him, a hostile league of Danes and Swedes was formed, he was betrayed by traitorous allies, and at length, on Monday, the 9th September 1000, in the great sea-fight of Swold, near Rügen, in the Baltic, King Olaf vanished for ever from the sight of men. The exact dating of this memorable event, as given in the Saga of Olaf Tryggvissón, is this: "So it is said that this battle was on Monday, the day after later Marymas. Then had passed by from the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ a thousand years. It was in the eighth year of the third ten of the rule of Ethelred, king in England, and in the eighth year of the reign of Sweyn Double-Beard, the Danish king. In that same year died Otto, he who was the third Kaiser of that name, and Henry took the rule."

This epoch-making event, the sea-fight of Swold, is carefully and

minutely described in the Saga of King Olaf. Kinglake did not take more pains to narrate with close accuracy the doings of Lord Raglan and his English in the Crimea, than this Icelandic chronicler does to record the last battle of the great king; and with great skill he does it. He has the rare art of simple and clear narrative, vigorous without effort, graphic and vivid, with deep pathos underlying all. He marshals the progress of his recital with the careful skill of a practised writer who knows how to veil his art with artless words; he leads up to the crisis of his narrative; he lets the curtain fall on the closing scene of the eventful day, slowly and sadly. He was no mere chronicler of dates and facts; no dry-as-dust gazetteer, who wrote the story of the "Passing of King Olaf," as we have it in the Saga.

The arrival of the king's fleet, and the coming on of the successive ships before the watching eyes of the leaders of the hostile fleet, ere the fight began, is minutely painted with painstaking accuracy. The leading ships, the chief commanders, and all the famous men are individually named, and the scene is described so as specially to give the king's ship, the *Long Serpent*, due place and prominence, and to make him and her the centre of the interest of the fateful day.

A famous ship, the *Long Serpent*, for centuries the theme of story in the North, famous as the greatest of Norse war-ships, still more famous as the flag-ship of the greatest Norse sea-king. Of her, Lord Dufferin writes with enthusiasm; about her, Longfellow has written poems. A thousand years has not extinguished her name and fame.

But it is at the close of the great fight, when with the setting sun the power and might of King Olaf was also setting in cloudy fire and flame, that the writer of the Saga shows his power and leaves a record wonderful in its simple force and pathos. The battle has been fiercely waged: victory long shaking her doubtful urn has at last thrown the iron dice, and the game has gone against King Olaf, the greatest of chiefs, the noblest and tallest and handsomest of men, the peerless leader, the beloved captain. It is all over. There is nothing left but to die and not surrender. On the poop of the *Long Serpent* stands the king and sees his brother, King Death, very nigh to him:

"On the lofty poop, high towering,
Reckless of the arrows showering,
Stands the smiling king!
Heaped-up foemen round him lying,
All his men now dead or dying,
None can succour bring!"

The Saga relates:

"That day, Kolbjörn, the king's marshal, with other forecastle men, were in charge of the bow. Kolbjörn was busked and equipped in arms and

apparel, just in the same manner as King Olaf, and why he so equipped himself was that he thought if chance should be as now was, that thus he might give some help to King Olaf. But when the most valiant of King Olaf's people were falling on the main-deck, then went Kolbjörn up on the poop to the king. It was not very easy then to know which was which, because Kolbjörn was the tallest and handsomest of men. On the poop there was so great a storm of war that the shields both of King Olaf and of Kolbjörn were studded with shafts. But when the Earl's men pressed aft to the poop, it seemed to them that so great a light shone over the king that they were not able to look at him. And when the light glided away they saw nowhere King Olaf."

Now there are many accounts of how it befell what happened then. Snorri Sturlason gives this account that when King Olaf saw that most of his people had fallen, and that Earl Eirik and many of his men were pressing aft to the poop, King Olaf and Kolbjörn the marshal both then leapt overboard, one over each side, while the Earl's men laid out in small boats and killed the men who had plunged overboard. And when the king himself had leapt overboard, they who were in the skiffs would have seized and brought him to the Earl, but King Olaf drew his shield over him and dived down. But Kolbjörn the marshal fell so on the sea that his shield was under him, and he was seized ere he could dive. This is what Snorri says. But from Kolbjörn's own words, it is told that when he had come up on the poop, and the king had begun to shoot at Earl Eirik, then saw Kolbjörn what other men had seen before—that blood was running from under the sleeve of the king's mail-shirt. And a little after, Kolbjörn thought that he saw the flash of the king leaping overboard in his armour, and all busked as he was that day, and when his foes would seize him, he drew his shield over him. And at that very moment Kolbjörn looked towards the foe, and saw that so many had boarded the *Long Serpent* that you might say the ship was full of them. Kolbjörn said afterwards that a little fright came over him just then. He turned to the side where King Olaf had been just before, and when he saw not the king, then he dropped his shield and leaped overboard. But when he came down on the sea, there was just under him a very handsome shield which he thought he knew to be that which King Olaf had borne that day. But as Kolbjörn came down on the shield, he was ware that a man was swimming gently below it. But the man let go the shield when he felt the weight fall on to it. Then was Kolbjörn seized and drawn up into a boat. They thought that it was King Olaf. Then was he led before Earl Eirik. But when the Earl was ware that it was Kolbjörn and not the king, he granted a truce to Kolbjörn. In that moment many of King Olaf's men leapt overboard; those who were still in life, and had till then made a gallant defence, so that men have their valour in remembrance. Thus Hallfred relates that men said how Thorkell Nefja had given his brother, King Olaf, the noblest help and staunchest following. Hallfred witnesses most fully

that Thorkell leapt overboard, last of all King Olaf's men. Thorkell swam to land, and so saved his life. But afterwards he made truce with Earl Eirik, as others of King Olaf's men did. For it is said that beside Kolbjörn, the marshal, six other men were picked up and had truce granted them: Einir Thamberskelfir, Thrand Skalg, Ogmund Sandi, Thorsteinn Oxfoot, Björn from Studla, Asbjörn from Mott. Earl Sigvald had lain by with his ships all that day, and was not in the fight.

When King Olaf had leapt overboard, the whole host of the Wendish fleet raised a shout of victory, and then Sigvald and his men dashed into the sea, and rowed to the fight. But at the same time as the shout was heard, and Sigvald rowed to the war-ships, the Wendish men who were in the Wendish smack, which twice that day had been King Olaf's, plunged their oars in the sea and rowed away as hard as they could. They rowed back to Wendland. And forthwith there were many men who said that "King Olaf must have stripped off his mail-shirt in his dive, and dived out below the long ships, and swam then to the Wendish smack, and that her men flit him to land."

Thus the various accounts are given in carefully exact language. Others similar follow—all varying a little in details, according to the standpoint of the narrator, but all agreeing in the main point: that at a precise moment of the battle, King Olaf was seen to leap overboard, or that (as some testify) they saw him up to a given moment, and then missed him. One of the accounts (by one of his enemies) has a curious vivid touch in its particulars. The man says that as Earl Eirik was charging aft to the poop, where the king was, that he stooped down to roll the dead bodies from before the Earl's feet, so that he should not be encumbered on his way, and that when he lifted his head afterwards he saw King Olaf no longer.

One thing is clear, that here the king vanished. The mythical way of beholding things was still common in these times, and the king's passing away speedily became mythic. The Wendish smack plays a great part in the development of the myth which soon took root and grew. He had swum to the Wendish ship; he had been received by her men; he had been "flit" by them ashore; he had fared to the Eastlands then; he had been seen there by Northmen; he was great in battle there; he had never perished in the sea-fight; tokens of him had been sent to Norway; he was again to come to his land and his folk, and be greater than of yore. King Olaf was too great to die as other men. The Northmen never could quite give up hope that he was to return to them. And the Sagaman says that it would indeed be some alleviation to their grief to know that he still lived, though far in the utmost east, and parted from them.

But King Olaf came not again, notwithstanding the grief of his

folk. How much they loved him, and admired, may be read in every line of the Sagas which tell of him. His beauty, his noble presence, his grand bearing, his dauntless courage, are the theme of their narratives. Kolbjörn was not easy to distinguish from the king, "because he was the tallest and handsomest of men"—therefore he dressed himself so that he might be mistaken for his lord, and, if need be, die for him. Nothing can surpass the simple nobility and devotedness in this account of Kolbjörn, as indeed the whole narrative, for its clearness, unpretending manner, and "good form," is in strange contrast to the degraded composition which our later age has adopted as the suitable style of chronicling current events. The Northman wrote as the men of old of other races seem to have always written—simply, clearly, carefully, thinking altogether of the thing to be said, and not of *how* they were to say it. An Icelandic Saga resembles the Hebrew Scripture in its noble simplicity, its unconscious pathos, its inherent poetry. No better "style" has yet been written in the world.

As a splendid example of it, take the following, which relates the close of the fateful day of Swold :

"It is said that this has been the most remarkable battle fought in the Northland for very many reasons. First, because of the valiant defence that King Olaf and his men made on board the *Long Serpent* ; for men know not any example of men resisting for so long a time and with such bravery, their enemies who were in overwhelming force ; for so hard was the onslaught of Earl Eirik and his people that it has become widely famous. This encounter was also famous because of the many slain and for the prowess of the Earl, insomuch that he won that ship which was then the largest and most beautiful that had been built in Norway, and of which ship many men had said that while she was manned with so noble a crew, she could never be won by arms while she floated the sea. But most of all for this reason was this fight famous, that this king was the most victorious and renowned in all the Danish tongue. And so much beloved was King Olaf that it was the common belief among the folk that never again in Norway nor elsewhere would such another king be born as he—— And now when the manslaughter on board the *Long Serpent* was ended, and the ship had been ransacked and cleared of the bodies of dead men, Thyri the Queen was brought up from under the hatches ; and she was grief-laden and wept very sore. And when Earl Eirik saw that, he went to her and said with much concern : ' Here hath befallen a terrible thing in the death of so many honourable men. We have brought great grief not on thee alone, Queen, but on all the folk of Norway, though—as is to be looked for—it may touch thee most nearly. And now, though I cannot undo what is done, yet I shall alleviate it as much as I may, in that, if I get any power in Norway, I shall own your rank in all ways that I can, and honour you in all things.' And the Queen answered : ' This thy promise is spoken out of great manliness and goodwill, such as thou hast often shown, and willingly would I live if I could, and accept thy noble kindness. But so sorely is my heart smitten with grief that I have no hope left of prolonging my life.' And it happened even so as she had said, that she could neither eat nor drink for sorrow. She inquired of Bishop Sigurd what is the least that one may be permitted in the sight of God to eat to sustain life. And with this sign of submission

died Thyri the Queen, after some days. Earl Eirik Hakonsson claimed the *Long Serpent* as his prize of conquest, and also a large share of the spoil. The Earl manned her skilfully with the most valiant men, and steered her himself. But though the *Long Serpent* was powerfully manned with hardy seamen, yet they could scarcely bring her—and with much awkwardness, so to speak—from the eastward into the Wick. She would never trim nor answer her helm at all, So Earl Eirik hewed up the *Long Serpent*. Some say that he even caused her to be burnt.

"Einir Thamborskelfir,¹ and other of those men to whom Earl Eirik had given truce after the battle, went north to Norway with the Earl. Vigi, King Olaf's hound, had lain in the chief cabin forward of the poop, during the day while the battle was, and so all the time afterwards. But when the Earl came east into the Wick with the *Long Serpent*, Einir Thamborskelfir before he went ashore, went to where the hound lay and said: 'Lordless are we now, Vigi.' And when he so spoke, the hound sprang up wailing, and howled as if a heart-spasm had seized him. Then he ran ashore with Einir and went up on a knoll. There lay he down and would take meat of no man, though he defended his food from other dogs, beast and fowl. Tears ran out of his eyes, down over his face, so mourned he his liege lord; and there he lay till he were dead. Now thus, in such like mournful manner, the Northmen lost the four most precious things in their land, even as was foretold by the blind bonde of Most."

We may take it as a certain fact of history, and not a mere mythical legend, that this Norse king was in truth a singularly remarkable man—were it but for the power he seems to have possessed of arousing in those about him the supreme emotions of admiration, love, and grief. His people loved him with that proud and tender tenacity of which the Northern heart has ever shown itself capable. The close of his career, as it is depicted in this Saga, is like the close of a Shakspearean tragedy, in its mournful greatness. The king dies, the queen dies, the faithful dog dies; the king's marshal strives also to die with his dear lord; the very ship which had been associated with his fame and glory is fated not to survive him; last of all, the king's Court poet dies of grief for his master. This episode also is so touching that it may appropriately close this paper. When we think of a king like John of England, of whom it could be said that hell itself was made fouler by his presence, and then recall him of whom we now speak—there is indeed a great gulf fixed.

Hallfred, the king's Court poet, was a special favourite with Olaf. At his baptism the king had been his sponsor, "had held him up" at the font. He had been sent on an embassy to the East to Earl

¹ He was but eighteen: the youngest of King Olaf's officers at Swold. Longfellow has a vivid picture of him at the crisis of the fight:

"Then with smile of joy defiant
On his boardless lip,
Scaled he, light and self-reliant,
Erik's dragon-ship.
Loose his golden locks were flowing,
Bright his armour gleamed:
Like St. Michael overthrowing
Lucifer, he seemed."

Tales of a Wayside Inn, xx.

Reginwald, about the marriage of Olaf's sister. He went back to Iceland the year before Olaf's death, and so was not present at Swold. There is a touching account of the way in which he came to hear the tidings of his master's fall. He was just about to fight a wager of battle, and he dreamed the night before that King Olaf appeared to him and told him not to fight in an unrighteous cause, and that he should go to the wood where the cross-roads met, and that there he would hear tidings which would touch him more nearly than this matter of the wager of battle. So he went, and lo, men in red coats riding from the ships, and from them he heard the news that was shocking the whole North. "Hallfred was as if he were stunned with a stone." He settled his suit, went out at once to Norway to hear what he could of the king, and then he made the dirge, "Olaf's Drápa." He seems to have composed no more afterwards, for he was never happy or at rest after the king's fall—"the world was empty," as he says; and though he went out to Sweden, where he had a wife and son, he could not stay there in peace, but was minded to go back to Iceland, and on that voyage he died, as the Saga tells us.

"The doughty king of the Northmen has come to his end :
 The prince is gone, the dear captain of the guard has sunk in death.
 'Twas pity that I was far away from the king when the iron rang,
 Though there is small help in one man.
 Now I am parted from him : the sword-tide has wrought this.
 I yearn for my lord every day ! It is the height of woe !
 Earth and heavens shall be rent in twain ere a lord shall be born like
 to Olaf,
 He was the best of earthly men.
 May Christ the pure keep the king's soul in Paradise !"

"No day is more famous in Northern story, no battle more stirring than this of Swold. Legends grew up about it, pathetic, marvellous, and miraculous. It was impossible for his surviving followers to believe that the holy king, their invincible leader, was really dead; and the fond, popular belief which has in its own dogged faithfulness conferred on such men as Frederick Red Beard, Arthur, and Charlemagne an immortality of hope, dealt also in like manner with the memory of Olaf."¹

¹ *Corpus Boreale*, vol. ii. 86.

THE THRIFT MOVEMENT ON THE CONTINENT.

ONE of the most hopeful signs of the times may be noted in the steady progress of the great Thrift movement. Dating its commencement from the year 1817, when the Legislature of this country first took the matter in hand by controlling the existing system of Savings Banks and widening the basis of their operations, the movement has slowly but surely extended, not only throughout the United Kingdom and the colonies, where signal results are being recorded from time to time, but over a wide and important area of the European continent. There is thus to be seen in the fruits of the economy of the people, as shown by the returns of the Thrift or Savings Banks, a potent and beneficent element which is of the greatest and far-reaching consequence, and which is being emphasized more and more every year. One State or country after another has wisely seen and provided for the necessity of training its people to habits of prudence and foresight with regard to money matters; and now there is scarcely a State in the whole of Europe that does not rejoice in its native system of Peoples' Banks, by which agency those very essential habits may be fostered to good purpose.

Some references, therefore, to the splendid work that has been accomplished during recent years on the Continent by such useful "aids to thrift" may not be without point at the present time, when the system of Savings Banks in vogue in this country is receiving more than its usual share of attention from Parliament in order to its being made more useful to the community. Although the Savings Bank movement in this country may be said practically to have had its origin nearly a century ago, it was in the year 1816-17, as has been indicated, that the Government, recognizing its immense importance to the community, gave it that status which it was so desirable to acquire in the general interest. With the Legislature's *imprimatur*, the success of such a system all the more readily became assured than without it, and the experience of seventy years has emphatically proved this. And so, since the year named, the control of the system has practically been in the hands of the State, though what may be called "Trustee" patronage—which, by the way, seems to have yielded the best results—is in vogue in one of the two divisions of it, the other having

been since 1861 under the supervision of the Postmaster-General. Probably it was the importance of the legislative step of 1816-17 that first directed the attention of the Governments of other countries to a system which had so much to recommend it to their notice, and seemed so worthy of adoption. At any rate, in the following year, 1818, a *Caisse d'Épargne et de Prévoyance* was established in Paris, much after the style and character of the Banks for Savings then multiplying rapidly throughout Great Britain and Ireland. Commencing its operations actually three years after Waterloo, the Paris *Caisse d'Épargne* is thus the pioneer of the system now flourishing over the length and breadth of the Continent, and is, of course, the most successful example of it. A remarkable amount of success has attended the career of this Thrift Bank from the beginning. Its accumulated deposits speak eloquently for the well-known persistent economy—in spite of many and extraordinary social disadvantages—of the generality of the Parisian working-classes; and if any moral element can indicate real progress, whether in the individual or the community, it is surely that of thrift or providence, which is one of the best certificates of character a man or a class of men can possess.

The recently issued Report of this great Savings Bank contains many interesting facts, of which the following are perhaps the most deserving of attention.

With its chief office (*caisse centrale*) in the Rue Coq-Héron, and thirty-eight auxiliary branches in Paris and suburbs, it is not surprising to find that over half a million depositors take advantage of this useful institution. The precise numbers are—males, 308,329; females, 239,246. The balances (*soldes*) due to each class are 65,427,753 francs and 52,668,573 francs respectively; in all, 547,575 depositors, owning no less a sum than 118,096,326 francs, or an average (*moyenne par livret*) of 215 frs. 67c. each. With so large a body of depositors—over 14,000 to each branch—it may be inferred that a year's business will show large operations, and the following table indicates the nature and extent of these:—

	Francs.		Deposit Transactions.
I. Sums received last year (1887) at branches	19,789,698	...	230,818
Do. do. at <i>caisse centrale</i>	27,586,474	...	180,782
Total	47,376,172	...	411,550
	Francs.		No. of Repayments.
II. Sums repaid last year (1887) at branches	3,446,015	...	13,310
Do. do. at <i>caisse centrale</i>	42,056,751	...	194,597
Total	45,502,766	...	207,907
III. Total sums received and paid since the commencement	Received.		Paid.
1,527,619,845 frs.	1,290,315,941 frs.	
Total number of transactions since the commencement			20,647,644

A very significant table is that giving the classification of depositors according to designations. It is often alleged that many of the Savings Bank depositors do not strictly come within the working or wage-earning category, and that, consequently, the sums deposited by them do not fairly represent working-class savings. Much may be said *pro* and *con.* on this aspect of the subject so far as it affects depositors in the Savings Banks in this country. With regard, however, to depositors in France, the following table distinctly shows that the working and artisan classes very decidedly preponderate in the Savings Banks there, and, indeed, constitute the main element contributing to the success of the banks:—

Last year 41,414 new depositors joined the *Caisse d'Épargne* of Paris and its branches. Of these, 20,417 were males and 20,997 females. These are generally divided into—(1) Workers and labourers (22,698); (2) *Artisans patentés* (1934); (3) Domestic, such as *gens de confiance*, *valets de chambre*, *cuisiniers*, *cochers*, *jardiniers*, *portiers*, &c. (1691); (4) *Employés*, such as *employés supérieurs*, *employés aux écritures*, *commis marchands*, *garçons de bureau*, *facteurs*, *conducteurs*, &c. (6412); (5) Military and marines (551); (6) other professions (973); (7) *Rentiers* (4170). It will be seen, therefore, from the foregoing distribution of classes, that those who joined the bank last year are the very persons requiring to do so, and it may therefore be fairly assumed that that average is representative of the whole body of depositors.

There is another feature of striking significance in the Report, and that is the large juvenile element which is being educated in the principles and practice of economy by means of the Savings Bank. In this country the subject of juvenile thrift has long engaged the attention of those whom it concerns. The number of primary schools where thrift is taught in the attached school Penny Bank is increasing year by year. The Education Department has already expressed a decided opinion as to the necessity for teaching the young its valuable principles, and many schools throughout the country, especially those situated in populous centres, have, for some years now, had Penny Banks introduced as a part of the school system, with the happiest results. Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, Edinburgh, are cities that may be mentioned in this connection as places where, as in London and Paris, the very youngest persons are in constant training in those habits which lie at the root of social success and happiness.

The *Épargne scolaire* of Paris is a wonderful success. No fewer than 224 schools with Penny Banks attached exist in Paris and neighbourhood for the benefit of the young. In the *arrondissement* of Popincourt there are thirty-three of these schools in a flourishing condition. Sixteen of them are for boys and seventeen for girls, of whom, together, 20,459 are depositors in the Savings

Bank, possessing considerable sums. Last year these children deposited 59,234 francs. Altogether, in the 224 schools thus doing excellent work there were last year 57,997 young people who enjoyed the benefit of that work, and that to the tune of 186,795 francs deposited, thus making a total of 1,292,092 francs invested by means of those most useful, if humble, agencies since their introduction into the Parisian school system thirteen years ago.

With such a civilizing centre as France to strike out from, and with the splendid example of *La Caisse d'Épargne de Paris* to enforce its advantages, the thrift movement began gradually to spread over the adjoining countries. Although many years had elapsed after the establishment of the system in France ere the movement assumed anything like hopeful dimensions elsewhere on the Continent, the day at length came when the Governments of other nationalities deemed it necessary to give the system their countenance. The Belgian Government was one of the first to apprehend its national advantages, and on the 16th of March 1865 it extended the State guarantee to the *Caisse générale d'Épargne et de Retraite*. The establishment and quick success of the Post Office Savings Bank system in this country a year or two before may have had something to do with suggesting something similar to the Government of Belgium. Be that as it may, the new idea thus engrafted soon took hold of the popular regard throughout the country, and began to make itself felt in the practical form as a national necessity. To show to what an extent it has been taken advantage of in Belgium since 1865 it has simply to be stated that after exactly twenty years' operations—i.e., to December 31, 1885—no less a sum than 189,061,089 francs had accumulated to the credit of 431,545 depositors, who thus have an average sum of 438 francs each, a highly commendable result.

Quite as satisfactory in its way is the result of the working of the Savings Bank system in Switzerland. There, the four chief institutions are those established at Bâle, Geneva, Neuchâtel, and Vaud. The result of these may thus be summarized:—

	Year.	No. of Depositors.	Amount of Investments.	Average Holding.
1. Bâle . . .	1886 ..	22,444 ...	14,335,827 francs ...	638 francs
2. Geneva . . .	1886 ...	40,038 ...	27,552,451 " ...	702 "
3. Neuchâtel . . .	1886 ...	34,366 ...	25,320,448 " ...	736 "
4. Vaud . . .	1886 ...	35,705 ...	24,125,965 " ...	709 "
Total, Switzerland . .		132,553 ...	91,334,691 " ...	688 "

Rightly or wrongly, the working and peasant classes of Italy do not always get a flattering character for industry or thrift. The Savings Bank returns of their country will, at any rate, tell their own story, which is most creditable indeed, upsetting any preconceived notions with respect to the habits of the working-class population of that sunny clime. In Italy, the four principal *Caisse d'Épargnes* are those established at Turin, Florence, Milan, and Bologna, and all do

large and flourishing businesses with the native working classes, as the subjoined figures will substantially testify :—

	Year.	No. of Depositors.	Amount of Investments.	Average Share.
1. Turin . .	1886 ...	67,007 ...	38,000,622 francs ...	566 francs
2. Florence . .	1886 ...	63,233 ...	56,212,758 „ ...	809 „
3. Milan . .	1886 ...	391,465 ...	357,015,749 „ ...	942 „
4. Bologna . .	1886 ...	73,881 ...	27,749,505 „ ...	375 „
Total, Italy . .		595,586 ..	478,978,634 „ ...	804 „

In Spain the Thrift movement, though it has taken root in the national soil, grows somewhat tardily. Madrid is, of course, the place where an estimate of its progress may best be made, and such progress is, on the whole, not by any means to be despised, but rather augurs well for the future of that country. Who would have said fifty years ago that Penny Savings Banks would flourish one day in Spain, and that the children of Madrid could save, in *escudos* and *reales*, nearly 30,000 *pesetas* (or francs) in a year? And yet they did so last year; while their parents and elder brothers and sisters, to the number of 37,866 persons, have gathered up in the Savings Bank of their capital no less than 15,766,166 francs—truly a worthy effort!

Austria-Hungary has welcomed the Thrift movement to some purpose. What is called *La Première Union de Caisse d'Épargne nationale de Pesth (Hongrie)* is an institution of some magnitude, having as many as 62,565 depositors who own 76,239,635 florins (190,599,089 francs); while its neighbour, the *Caisse d'Épargne de Bohême*, has actually 116,237 deposit accounts containing value to the amount of 100,319,435 florins (or 250,798,587 francs).

If Denmark and Sweden are at all behind in this important movement, they are at least making a very good effort to show that they approve of it and have faith in its principles. In the former country 71,943 persons have an interest in the Savings Bank established at Copenhagen, and that to a very considerable sum, 60,722,401 crowns being the amount of their holding on the 31st of March 1886. In the latter country, credited usually with the good name of provident, 88,256 Swedes maintain the character of the nation by a saved sum of money representing 25,649,577 francs.

In the Pays-Bas, 44,396 persons, depositing over 5,000,000 florins in the Savings Bank of Amsterdam, have to that extent signalized their approval of the system, which has only been, it must be said, comparatively recently extended to them. It appears that they emphatically endorse the principles involved. Nor are their compatriots resident in Rotterdam a whit less anxious to do so, 43,373 of whom hold 7,778,047 florins to their credit in the local *Caisse d'Épargne*; while the *Caisse d'Épargne postale* holds in addition 6,368,047 florins for 112,308 separate depositors, most of whom are independent of those attached to the other Savings Bank system.

In Germany the system of Peoples', or Thrift, Banks is as extensively adopted, and with as gratifying success, as in any other country on the Continent. Every town of any size or consequence throughout the great Fatherland enjoys its savings institution, where every week hundreds of industrious artisans and their wives resort with their spare earnings. The Post Office system has in Germany also, as in not a few other continental countries, been engrafted on the already existing system. With such an opportunity as is afforded by the two systems, the working-classes of Germany cannot complain of any lack of inducement to maintain that character for frugality and thrift which has been theirs for many generations. It is computed that the capital invested in these banks throughout Germany by the distinctively wage-earning classes of the people amounts to over 3,000,000,000 marks. Returns from the Savings Banks established at two representative cities, such as Hamburg and Frankfort-on-the-Maine, give the amounts respectively deposited there at over 23,000,000 marks for the former, and 28,000,000 marks for the latter.

Surely, therefore, nothing could augur more hopefully than this for the future prosperity and happiness of vast numbers of the industrial classes of these Continental countries. Of course, the countless numbers who are indifferent to any such prudential efforts as are being put forth from year to year by those to whom the great Thrift movements have been brought near, naturally deter the thoughtful from taking too hopeful a forecast of the ultimate benefit to be accomplished by its means. But it must not be forgotten that the age of Savings, or Peoples', Banks is only contemporary with the experience of many persons still comparatively young. If, therefore, the movement has accomplished so much as above described for the general well-being both at home and abroad within the space of half a century, what results may it not yet achieve in the years to come?

LORD STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE.¹

AMONG the diplomatists of the nineteenth century there are few more remarkable figures than that of the subject of the present notice, the great Ambassador, who may be said to have not merely carried out, but directed, the Eastern policy of England, at some of the most critical periods of European history. His biography was certainly well worth writing for this reason alone, and it gains an additional interest when we remember the extraordinary age which he reached. Though statesmen as a rule are a tolerably long-lived race, yet there are few of them who have reached, as Lord Stratford did, the age of ninety-three.

He was born in the midst of the famous trial of Warren Hastings; the fall of the Bastille occurred when he was more than two years old; he might have had some faint remembrance of the commencement of the Revolutionary War, which took place in his sixth year. He had passed from boyhood into youth when the battle of Trafalgar was fought, and the Congress of Vienna was by no means the first stage of a diplomatic career, of which the best known part was in connection with the events which preceded the Crimean War, forty years later. He survived to take part in the discussions attending the revival of the Eastern Question under Lord Beaconsfield's Government, and his death did not take place till the year in which that Government fell from power.

The Life of such a man could scarcely fail to be interesting, and Lord Stratford has by no means been unfortunate in his biographer. Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole is already well known as an authority on Eastern subjects, and his latest work will certainly not diminish his reputation.

As he remarks in his preface, there is seldom any lack of materials for the biography of an ambassador, and in the present case, for the whole early career of Lord Stratford we enjoy the advantage of possessing a detailed narrative from his own hand, extending down to the close of the Greek Revolution, after which it becomes fragmentary. Besides this, of course, there are countless letters and despatches.

¹ *The Life of the Right Hon. Stratford Canning, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe K.G.*, from his Memoirs, Private and Official Papers. By Stanley Lane-Poole. 2 vols. Longmans & Co.

during the period of the Ambassador's residence at Constantinople ; so that the difficulty is to decide among such abundance what is most worthy of selection—a task which Mr. Lane-Poole has performed with much skill.

Stratford Canning (to give Lord Stratford his original name, and the one which he bore during the greater part of his career) came of a distinguished family. He was a cousin of the great man who will always rank as one of the most illustrious statesmen in English history—certainly the finest character ever associated with the Tory party. His father, the younger brother of George Canning's father, was, curiously enough, like the latter, disinherited for marrying contrary to his father's wishes. Originally of Irish extraction, he settled in London, where the future Ambassador was born, on November 5, 1786. Six months after Stratford's birth, his mother was left a widow, with an infant and four elder children to care for. She must, as Mr. Lane-Poole remarks, have been a remarkable woman ; and her son always speaks of her with the deepest reverence and affection, and expresses the warmest sense of the gratitude due to her for the manner in which she fulfilled the duties which fell to her lot.

Of his childhood Lord Stratford has recorded some interesting reminiscences. At the age of six, he was sent to a school in Hackney kept by a Mr. Newcome, who is described as "a somewhat priggish potentate." Among the recollections of his school days, he mentions the announcement of Lord Howe's great victory in June 1794, and the even more gratifying corollary of a holiday in consequence. From Hackney he passed to Eton, where he remained for ten years. He mentions that, on one occasion, he was noticed by the King, George III., who was in the habit of observing the Eton boys from the terrace of Windsor Castle. He asked Stratford what part of the school he was in, and, on his replying that he was in the sixth form, his Majesty remarked, "A much greater man than I can ever make you." In his school days, the future diplomatist sometimes had the fortune to be permitted to attend a debate in the House of Commons, and he has related how he listened with "awed attention" to a speech of William Pitt.

At the age of nineteen he left Eton, and proceeded to King's College, Cambridge. His University career was but a short one ; for, before he had attained his majority, he had already entered upon the field of public life, whose paths he was destined so long to tread. He owed his first appointment to his cousin George Canning, who, when he became Foreign Secretary, in 1807, gave his relative the post of *précis*-writer in the Foreign Office.

He was next employed as one of the secretaries of the mission sent to Denmark after the bombardment of Copenhagen in 1807 to endeavour to restore friendly relations between England and the Danish Government. Nothing, however, was effected. The Danes were

naturally exasperated, and refused all overtures; and after two months the mission returned home without result.

The voyage back to England appears to have been attended with much discomfort. To quote from the secretary's diary: "The accommodations on board were so wretched that every attempt to eat or sleep was equally a trial of temper. The biscuits crawled, the water was almost the colour of mahogany, and I have a vivid recollection of a leg of mutton not larger than a turkey's drumstick."

Soon after his return from Denmark the young diplomatist entered upon the long period of his connection with the East, which extended, with intervals, over more than half a century. In 1808 he was appointed secretary to Mr. Adair, British plenipotentiary to Constantinople.

The story of the first part of Stratford Canning's Turkish career presents no particular features of interest. We get merely the impression of a constant and wearisome struggle between French and English influence in the councils of the Porte, of Turkish procrastination overcome eventually by British tenacity. A rather amusing incident is recorded illustrating this conflict. A demand had been made by Mr. Adair which the Turkish Ministers wished to evade, and we are told that

"Prince Constantine Morouzi, the Porte's chief interpreter, had been sent in form to wait on the Ambassador, with pressing entreaties that he would take into account the embarrassments of the case, and with friendly forbearance cease to urge his claim. His Excellency was obdurate, and, in despair, as a last resource, the dragoman threw himself on his knees, and vowed that he would not rise till his petition was granted. Mr. Adair was not to be done by this manœuvre. He took forthwith to the same attitude in front of his kneeling suppliant, and declared his resolution not to rise before the Prince had himself resumed the perpendicular. It was a regular fix, and afforded much amusement to disinterested parties who had the good fortune to witness it from an opposite window."

In 1810 Mr. Adair was compelled by ill-health to resign his post, and the vacant Ambassadorship was filled by his secretary. The office was only held by him, in this his first tenure of it, for two years, but in this period he achieved his first great diplomatic success, and did a great service to his country, and to the cause of European liberty against the aggressions of Napoleon, by negotiating the Treaty of Bucharest between Russia and Turkey, which bound both to the interests of England, virtually allied both Powers with her against France, and completely "check-mated," as Mr. Lane-Poole expresses it, Bonaparte's Eastern policy.

Notwithstanding the ardour with which the Ambassador had thrown himself into the duties of his mission, he had always felt, he tells us, like an exile, and longed to return to his native land; and, shortly after the conclusion of the Treaty, he succeeded in obtaining his recall home, where he enjoyed two years of well-earned rest.

He took a keen interest in English politics, and soon after his return he was present at the election of his cousin for Liverpool, of which he has left a short but graphic account, which is worth quoting :—

“We found the town in an uproar. Party ran high, bitter speeches were exchanged on the hustings, and mobs were violent in the streets. Windows were broken, candidates pelted, and for more effective missiles resort was had without ceremony to the pavement and the area rails. Fortune declared finally in favour of Mr. Canning, who was cheered, chaired, and feasted to the top of his bent. I cannot venture to say how many dinners were given to him and his friends by the Tory capitalists of Liverpool. I know that they were enough, with the help of turtle and punch, to imperil health far more than any riotous assaults in the street.”

Stratford Canning was desirous of entering the Parliamentary arena where his cousin was winning such laurels, but fate seemed to have ruled that he was always to be a diplomatist, and in 1814 we find him in harness again as Envoy-Extraordinary to Switzerland. His first impressions of the country are most enthusiastic. He writes to a friend :—

“You are and must be an owl till you set foot in this land of liberty and cocked hats. The finest mountains, the greenest hills, the richest plains, the neatest houses, the best inns, the most limpid streams, and, for aught I know, the most delightful fair ones ever yet beheld in this transitory sphere! Elysium and Mahomet's seventh heaven are mere jokes to this earthly anticipation of Paradise!”

His business, however, was not merely to enjoy himself, but to assist in a most important and delicate task, the settlement on a new basis of the Swiss Federal Constitution after the confusion of the revolutionary wars, and to help in drawing up a scheme of reunion, to be submitted to the Congress of Vienna, which was then entering upon the labour of rearranging the map of Europe after the first downfall of Napoleon. The evident interest which the envoy felt in the work of drawing up a constitution for a free people is most honourable to him, and, one cannot help feeling, was much more congenial to his nature than a struggle for influence in the councils of an Eastern despotism.

From Switzerland he was soon summoned to Vienna, to take part in the committee of the Congress on Swiss affairs, though he was not one of the regular members of the Congress. He gives a lively description of the great influx of strangers into the Austrian capital, which rendered it difficult to find a lodging. “The bustle of this place is quite dreadful,” he writes to his mother, “and I have the misfortune to have the most dismal, noisy, and dirty lodging ever seen, and must think myself highly fortunate to procure even this.”

Of the proceedings of the Congress in general he gives the following summary: “*England mediates; France protects old rights*

and virtuous principles ; Russia dictates sentimentality, and aggrandizes herself for the general welfare ; Austria and Prussia squabble, mutually deceiving and deceived ; the others claim and protest, some one, some both. All agree in dancing and wearing fine coats, and all wonder why the Congress lasts so long."

The well-known scene of the interruption of the proceedings of the Congress by the news of Napoleon's escape from Elba is told in a few brief but graphic sentences :—

"The lay-conclave at Vienna was suddenly roused by a rattling peal of thunder. . . . The pen gave way to the sword, the ink-bottle to the magazine. All eyes settled upon the Duke of Wellington, and, to judge by the flash of his eyes, when I saw him coming downstairs after his first war conference with the sovereigns, he felt within himself that confidence which he had so justly and generally imparted to others. One might now imagine that he had already in vision anticipated the apotheosis of Waterloo."

After the dispersion of the Congress, Canning resumed his duties in Switzerland, where he remained as Minister for four years longer. During this time he continued to take a keen interest in the reorganization of the Confederation, and the Swiss statesmen acknowledged the benefits they had derived from his advice in many matters, particularly in connection with the remodelling of the Federal army.

In 1819 he returned to England, but again his destiny denied him a long sojourn in his native country, and in the next year he went out as Minister to the United States. A voyage to America then was a very different affair from what it is in our own day. It rarely took less than six weeks, and might last for two months or more. The cost, too, was immensely greater than now. We are told that Canning's return voyage, when he travelled nearly alone, cost him £300 ; and when he first went out, with "two secretaries and eleven servants, and seventy tons weight of luggage," the expense must have been much greater. "It took four days, in an epoch when the steam-crane was unknown, to put all the baggage on board."

The Ambassador's observations on the condition of the American commonwealth, then still almost in its early youth, are very interesting, and, though coloured somewhat by the prejudices which it was natural for an Old World diplomatist to entertain when transplanted into a world of so little ceremony and of such free and easy manners, are not, on the whole, unfair.

He has recorded some amusing incidents of his stay in Washington. On one occasion, at an entertainment given by the President,

"A young lady gave him a flower, and he accepted it, and thought it a very pretty proceeding. To his dismay one of his friends informed him that this was the recognized form of betrothal in Washington. His Excellency, in a terrible state of consternation, rushed to his room and addressed a despatch to the girl, disclaiming any particular significance that might be attached to the simple operation of placing a flower given by her fair hands

in his button-hole, and requesting her to reply in similar terms. A regular convention was signed, and Canning got out of the scrape, like a good diplomatist, without cession or indemnity."

His work in America was to maintain peace between the States and England, which was by no means as easy a matter then as it appears to us now. It was only six years since the nations had been at war, and "it needed very little to fan the kindling spark into a flame again." There were many causes of dispute, which are not of much interest now, only it may be mentioned that the interminable Fisheries Question was one of them. Canning's mission was, on the whole, successful, and when he returned to England in 1823 he had the satisfaction of proving that the relations between "mother and daughter," as he styles them, were on a better footing than when he went out.

Soon after his return he entered upon that portion of his career which, with the exception of the period of the Crimean War, was the most important episode in his life, and which embraced what was probably the one among his achievements for which he will be most admired by posterity—his share in the liberation of Greece. In this task he was the coadjutor of his cousin, George Canning, who was now again at the Foreign Office, and had already begun to exercise the liberalizing influence on England's foreign policy which constitutes one of his chief titles to our regard.

Stratford, like George, and like all Englishmen who had a spark of generous feeling, looked with sympathy on the heroic exertions the Greeks were making to deliver themselves from Turkish tyranny. On receiving the first intelligence of the Greek revolution, he writes, from America, using a phrase made famous by its employment in our own day by Mr. Gladstone: "I wish with all my soul that the Greeks were put in possession of their whole patrimony, and that the Sultan were driven bag and baggage into the heart of Asia."

However, it was not the intention of the Foreign Minister that England should commit herself to active participation in the struggle. He thought that the question might be settled peacefully by the concert of the European Powers, and he desired to prevent the isolated action of any one of them. He believed that if the five great Powers could be brought to agree on a scheme of pacification, securing the internal independence of Greece, while retaining the nominal sovereignty of the Porte, the Turks might be induced to give way.

But there were great difficulties in bringing about this European concert, especially in gaining the consent of the two States most directly concerned in the Eastern Question—Austria and Russia. The former, as represented by her Chancellor, Metternich, the embodiment of determined enmity to Liberal ideas, looked with hostility on revolution in Greece as everywhere else, and desired either entire non-intervention or intervention to put down the revolution. The

Russian Emperor, Alexander I., was distracted by conflicting principles. On the one hand, he, like Metternich, was the enemy of revolution generally; on the other hand, the traditional national and religious animosity between Russia and Turkey urged him to a policy of war in behalf alike of the Greek cause and of the aggrandisement of his own Empire.

Matters being in this condition, Stratford Canning was despatched in 1824 on a mission to Vienna and St. Petersburg, to endeavour to bring Austria and Russia into line with English policy on the Greek Question. At the former place he met with little success: Metternich was not to be drawn from his position, and at first was even rude to the British Minister. "The same sofa held us both, and I had not been long seated when he said to me, rather curtly, 'You have a bug on your sleeve.' Whether he meant to try me, or to provide for his own security, I know not, but the remark was not pleasing, and I could only defend myself at the expense of the hotel." The Austrian Chancellor was more civil afterwards, but still held to his own views, and Canning proceeded on his mission to Russia. The journey was made in mid-winter, and there was an upset in the snow by the way. "Our postilion first struck out one of our lights by running against Scylla, in the shape of a waggon, and then, to avoid a repetition of that disaster, turned us gently over into a Charybdis about as deep as Clewer ditch, which skirted the road." There were some other delays, but, in spite of all mishaps, the party reached St. Petersburg in safety.

Here the Ambassador found the aspect of affairs rather more favourable than at Vienna, and in the space of his two months' stay considerable progress was made towards a friendly understanding between England and the Czar Alexander. He left a very favourable impression in Russian society, and took his departure homewards amid many demonstrations of friendliness.

After a short stay in England, and a last interview with his cousin, whom he was never to see again, Stratford Canning proceeded on his second mission to Constantinople. His task there seemed well-nigh hopeless. He had, if possible, to induce the Turks to consent to the virtual, if not nominal, severance of Greece from their rule, and this at a time when the war was going on in their favour, owing to the powerful assistance of the Porte's Egyptian vassal. He soon saw that to achieve this, and without at least the menace of force, was utterly out of the question. The unanimous pressure of the European Powers might have prevailed, but there was no chance of this: the Austrian and Prussian Ministers were intriguing against England, and encouraging the Turks to resist her demands. Both the Cannings, unwilling as they had been to resort to force, now saw that, if the Greeks were to be saved from extermina-

tion at the hands of the Egyptian hordes who were laying waste the Morea, something more than mere mediation was necessary.

Events rapidly moved in the direction of joint action by England and Russia. Alexander was dead, and his successor Nicholas was inclined for more vigorous measures. The alliance of the two Powers soon received a third member by the addition of France, and on July 6, 1827, the celebrated Treaty of London was signed, by which the three countries agreed on united action to settle the Greek Question. The Treaty was followed by the despatch of the squadrons of the allied States to the Mediterranean, with instructions to prevent the landing of any more Egyptians in Greece. The destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino followed. When the news of the encounter reached Constantinople, the Ambassadors were placed in a very critical position. "What could they do? To stay with their arms crossed, and to suppose that such a thunderstroke as that of Navarino could end in mere reverberation, would be simply ridiculous." The battle had merely exasperated, without intimidating, the Turks, and the only means of bringing the Porte to reason appeared to be the withdrawal of the three embassies. This was accordingly effected amid rather exciting circumstances, for the Porte refused to grant the Ambassadors passports, on the ground that they were acting without express orders from their Governments. They had accordingly to run the risk of being stopped, but no obstacles were encountered, and they quitted the Turkish capital in safety.

Meanwhile a great calamity had befallen both England and the Greek cause in the death of George Canning. His successor, the Duke of Wellington, had never favoured intervention on behalf of Greece, and, though Russia had now resolved to enforce the demands of the Allies by war, he could not be induced to take any decisive action. He rejected Stratford Canning's advice to send a force into the Morea in conjunction with France to expel the Egyptians and deliver the victims of their atrocities, and the measure was ultimately carried out by the French alone.

The alliance of the three Powers, though in fact broken by the conduct of the British Government, still continued nominally to exist, and while the war between Russia and Turkey was still being waged, a Conference of the Allies was held in the Greek island of Poros to settle the frontier of liberated Greece. Canning was despatched as British representative to the Conference. On his way he visited many places in Greece, and saw fearful traces of Turkish cruelty, which made him the more eager to bring the matter to a final settlement. He remarks: "Here is this poor country of Greece mangled and panting like a frog just torn from the jaws of a serpent, with scarce enough life in its veins to make it capable of sustaining the preservation so miraculously offered to it. And

further, there is the serpent, scotched but not slain, resigning its prey with sullen reluctance, while it grapples with one assailant. and seeks to gain time from the others for scenting fresh means of resistance and oppression." The proceedings at Poros were harmonious, the Ambassadors agreed upon a settlement of the frontier which appeared satisfactory, and the Articles were submitted to their respective Governments for their approval; after which it was intended that the English and French representatives should proceed to Constantinople to endeavour to gain the assent of the Porte and to persuade it to come to terms with Russia. The British Government, however, as represented by Lord Aberdeen, the Foreign Secretary, had resolved to confine Greece within the narrow limits of the Morea and the adjacent islands. Accordingly Canning was instructed, while nominally pressing the Poros demands on the Porte, to work really in the opposite direction, and to accept any Turkish proposal as to the frontier which might be advanced as a counter-scheme. He refused to act what he considered a double part and to lend himself to cheating the Greeks out of their reasonable expectations, and resigned his post. Sir R. Gordon, Lord Aberdeen's brother, was appointed in his stead. "I thanked my God," Canning told a friend, "that the Government did not dare to ask me to do such work as they had given that fellow Gordon."

An interval of nearly three years elapsed before he was again employed in the diplomatic world. In the interval, Turkey had been forced to make peace with Russia, and to concede the independence of Greece, but the frontier still remained unsettled. The Wellington Ministry no longer held power; and their successors, the Government of Lord Grey, desiring to bring the matter to a final arrangement, wisely decided to employ the services of the most able and honest diplomatist whom England possessed. In 1831 Canning was sent for the third time to Constantinople; and on this occasion he met with more rapid and complete success than he had ever been fortunate enough to achieve before. The consent of the Porte was obtained to a frontier for Greece substantially answering to that fixed at Poros; and the Ambassador returned home to enjoy his well-earned laurels.

With the exception of a short mission to Spain, Canning had now ten years of rest from diplomacy, and during this period he was able to gratify his long-felt ambition of entering Parliament. From 1834 to 1842 he represented King's Lynn as a follower of Sir Robert Peel, and as the colleague of Lord George Bentinck, afterwards the leader of the Protectionists against Peel's Free Trade policy.

It cannot be said that his Parliamentary career will add anything to his fame. The views which he expresses on British politics are not very enlightened; and especially is this the case with regard to

what then, as now, was a most pressing subject—the condition of Ireland. He could not realize the intolerable grievances of the Irish people, and only looked with horror on the somewhat violent agitation by which O'Connell sought to free his country. He says of the Irishman: "No wonder 'gainst reason and order he pulls, With his head of potaty and month full of bulls."

He was merely disgusted when Lord Melbourne and the Whig leaders entered into an agreement with O'Connell, and actually ventured on the attempt to govern Ireland in accordance with the wishes of its people and with the goodwill of their leaders. He could see nothing but evil in what must be pronounced one of the bravest and wisest steps ever taken by an English Minister, which had the effect of rendering Ireland, during the six years of the Melbourne Ministry, tranquil and loyal to a degree unknown before or since, and which, if the Government had been stronger and had been able to carry out their policy in legislation as well as in administration, might (if anything could) have reconciled the Irish to the Union.

It is certainly a blemish on the fame of the great Ambassador that the only active part he ever took in English politics should have been as a member of what must be pronounced about the most mischievous and narrow-minded Opposition which this century has witnessed, in spite of the eminent men it contained. That Opposition unfortunately frustrated the fairest opportunity there ever was since the Union of reuniting the two sister islands to each other. It is a pleasure to turn from this unfortunate episode in Canning's career to his re-entry into his proper sphere of work, in which none could rival him, for we have now come to the epoch at which his greatest fame was acquired, his fourth mission to Constantinople, which lasted, with intervals, from 1842 to 1858.

Every one has heard of the "Great Elchi," whose power was felt, as his biographer puts it, "from end to end of the Turkish dominions," and every one has felt proud that his country had such a voice to speak for her.

Perhaps, however, his real title to admiration has hardly been sufficiently appreciated. He has been looked upon simply as the representative of the policy of supporting Turkey against Russia, and his name was even most unfairly quoted as an authority on the side of those who contended that in the interests of England the Ottoman Empire must be bolstered up, however atrocious its misgovernment might be. No idea could be farther from Canning's thoughts. His desire was to save the Turks from themselves, to rescue their Empire by making it a civilized and well-governed European State. This was the task to which he devoted all his energies for so many years. It must, however, be said that the impression pro-

duced by the record of this long and arduous struggle goes far to strengthen the views of those who maintain that for a Mahometan power to be a really good ruler of European and Christian subjects is an utter impossibility. No one surely could bring to the work of Turkish reform more single-mindedness of purpose, more ability, and more resolute strength of will than Stratford Canning, and yet he himself would have admitted that his efforts ended in little else than failure. Good laws enough were made in answer to his demands, but they were mere waste paper as regards their practical execution. All his utmost exertions could achieve was to make the Ottoman Government put on an outward show of decency for a time. It is not likely that any such gross outrages as the Bulgarian massacres of 1876 could have been committed while Canning was at Constantinople, but there is abundant evidence in his Life of the oppression and misgovernment practised in out-of-the-way corners of Turkey, which all his endeavours could not effectually check in many cases. And when once his pressure was removed, whatever improvement had been brought about soon disappeared, and matters became worse than ever. None the less, however, does the Ambassador deserve the highest praise for having so nobly and manfully devoted himself to such a work as he set before him; meagre though the results may have been, but certainly not through any fault of his. The first great concession which he succeeded in extorting from the Porte was the repeal of the law ordering the death of all apostates from Islam. The Turkish Ministers were obstinate, and pleaded an express precept of the Koran. Canning, however, turned up the passage, and proved that it did not bear the meaning they put upon it. Still they hesitated, but the Ambassador was determined, and the law was repealed. For a time it seemed as if his hopes might be realized. He had a great personal influence over the Sultan Abdul Mejid. The reactionary Ministers were dismissed, and power passed into the hands of Reshid Pasha, who seems really, as much as any Turk could, to have desired reform. Canning always spoke of him as the most enlightened statesman he ever met with in Constantinople, but unfortunately there were hardly any others of his stamp. In 1846 the Ambassador left Turkey for the space of two years, in which he was again employed on a mission to his old friends the Swiss. He assisted in the pacification of the Republic after the Civil War of 1847, and in the restoration of the Federal Constitution on a firmer basis. In 1848, the year of revolutions, he returned to his Turkish post, making his journey overland through the disturbed countries of Germany and Austria, and reporting to the Foreign Office on the affairs of each by the way.

Of the state of the Prussian capital he writes as follows: "Society is shaken to its foundation. No balls, no parties, no dinners,

theatres deserted, and conversation carried on in sighs and whispers." After a brief stay at Vienna and Athens, Canning arrived at Constantinople once more, and devoted his energies again to the work of Turkish reform. He soon had a task on hand which required all his resolution and firmness of purpose to deal with. In 1849, after the suppression of the Hungarian national movement, most of its leaders had taken refuge in the Turkish dominions, and a demand was at once made by the Austrian and Russian Governments for their surrender. The admirers of the Turks have been in the habit of extolling their courage and humanity in rejecting this request, but in fact nearly all the credit should be given to the English Ambassador.

There is no reason to believe that any of the Turkish Ministers, except perhaps Reshid, would have felt any particular scruple in delivering up political refugees to a fate they themselves would certainly have inflicted on insurgents in their own dominions, and it was nothing but the prompt action of Canning that saved the fugitives. He insisted on the Porte refusing the Austrian demands, and promised the full support of his Government. The English Ministry fully approved of their representative's conduct, and ordered the British fleet to proceed to the Dardanelles if necessary. The Imperial Powers saw that they would have to face a war with England if they persisted, and accordingly ceased from pressing for the extradition of the Hungarians.

This exciting episode was followed by three years of tranquillity, as far as concerned the external relations of Turkey, during which Canning once more strove to compel the Porte to reform its administration. As usual, however, he was put off with fine promises and little else. Weary of the fruitless endeavour, he was obliged to admit that "the great game of improvement is altogether up for the present, and, though I shall do my best to promote the adoption of separate measures, it is impossible for me to conceal that the main object of my stay here is all but gone." Sick at heart at the failure of his heroic efforts, he left Constantinople, in June 1852, as he hoped not to return, but fate had willed otherwise. Before his departure he had been raised to the peerage by Lord Derby's Government, with the title of Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe.

But now the clouds were again gathering in the East. The Franco-Russian dispute on the subject of the Holy Places had begun, and, in view of the possible contingencies to which it might lead, it was of importance that England should be well represented at Constantinople, and there could be no doubt who was the man for the post.

So now really for the last time Lord Stratford turned his face eastwards. His journey, as on the previous occasion, was made overland,

and many mishaps befell him on the way. On the journey to Vienna, made now by the recently opened railway, there were several vexatious delays. "It must be allowed," writes the Ambassador, "that there are serious drawbacks to the advantage of railway travelling. The hurry, the noise, the jostling, the confusion of tongues and persons, the dirty accommodation, the bad food, the ignorance of what one passes through, have all to find their compensation in the single advantage of speed." After the railroad was quitted, the roads were found blocked with snow in many places, but at last the haven of Trieste was reached, from which the party proceeded by sea to Constantinople.

We have now come to Lord Stratford's conduct of the negotiations preceding the Crimean War, which his biographer regards as "the corner-stone of his career." It was undoubtedly the period of his life which won him his principal fame in the eyes of the generality of his countrymen, but it may turn out also to be the one about which opinions in the present day will most differ. Those who have followed with the greatest admiration the share taken by Lord Stratford in the liberation of Greece, and his subsequent efforts to reform the administration of Turkey, may be inclined to think that he made a mistake in lending himself to the support of a Power which had proved so obstinately deaf to all his instructions and warnings. They will contend that the Turks had well deserved to be left to their fate; that the dissolution of their empire would have been a great blessing to the majority of its inhabitants; and that the wisest course would have been to enter into an arrangement with Russia, by which English interests could have been effectually safe-guarded.

It is certain, and is not denied by supporters of the policy of the Crimean War, that the Emperor Nicholas was willing to enter into such an agreement, and that he did not desire to quarrel with England. It is probable that those who look back on these events from a distance of thirty years will be of opinion that this would have been the best policy for England; but, at the same time, the men of those days may claim some excuse for looking at matters rather differently. There were certainly many grounds for distrusting the policy of Russia; and, though there was already good reason for believing that the Turks could never be brought to a real reform of their government, yet the case against them was not quite so hideously clear as it was after the massacres of 1876.

It is apparent, too, from Mr. Poole's narrative, that it is a mistake to make—as has often been done, whether for praise or blame—Lord Stratford the chief author of the Crimean War. On the contrary,

it seems that he was desirous of preserving the peace as long as it could be done, consistently with his views of the necessity of preventing the dissolution of the Turkish Empire.

The question of the Holy Places was soon settled; but presently there emerged a much more formidable matter—the Russian claim to a protectorate over the members of the Greek Church in Turkey. This was the main point at issue through all the complicated and rather tedious negotiations which occupied the greater part of 1853; and on the judgment we form as to the justice of this demand will depend our opinion of the Crimean War.

Mr. Poole strongly maintains, in agreement with the almost universal sentiment of Englishmen at the time, that the Russian proposal was altogether unreasonable, and that Lord Stratford was therefore right in advising the Turks to reject it. Of course, if it be supposed that the Ottoman Empire was to be considered as one of the Powers of Europe, entitled to the rights of a civilized nation, the conduct of the Emperor Nicholas and his ambassador Menshikov was quite as outrageous as public opinion in England thought it to be. But this is exactly what Russia would have denied, and not without reason. She would have contended that the dominion of the Turks over their Christian subjects, who, it must be remembered, constituted the great majority of the inhabitants of European Turkey, was nothing more than an organized system of oppression, which she could not allow her co-religionists to remain under.

That there was but too much truth in this, Lord Stratford had the best reason to know. We have seen that he had strained all the arts of friendly pressure to make the government of Turkey worthy of the names of civilized and European, and that he had himself admitted that the fruit of his exertions had been little else than disappointment. It must, then, seem rather strange that he should not have considered that the Russian Emperor might possibly have reason on his side, if he was even somewhat overbearing and peremptory, in his claims on behalf of the victims of Turkish oppression; who must, as being of the same religion, and many of them of the same race as himself, be objects of greater interest to him than they could be to an Englishman. It cannot certainly cause any surprise that Russia refused to accept as any satisfaction of her demands, proclamations by the Porte, issued at Lord Stratford's advice, promising the most admirable treatment of its Christian subjects; and it must be pronounced unreasonable of the English Ambassador to expect that the matter could be settled by promises which his past experience ought to have taught him were certain to be nothing but waste-paper. The refusal of the Russian demands led to the occupation of the

Danubian Principalities in the summer of 1853. War was not yet, however, declared between Russia and Turkey, and many efforts were made to preserve peace. Lord Stratford, no doubt, did the best he could to avert hostilities, in the position which he had taken up of regarding the Russian claim for a protectorate as inadmissible, but it can be no matter of wonder that he was unsuccessful.

Mr. Poole's narrative is coloured by a very decidedly anti-Russian bias, but even from it evidence may be gained that Russia was by no means as entirely in the wrong, even on technical diplomatic grounds, as he would have us believe. When the representatives of the Powers at Vienna, in August 1853, had agreed on a plan of pacification known as the Vienna Note, the Russian Emperor accepted it, believing it afforded effective security for the protection of the Christians; but the Turks refused to agree to it without modifications which destroyed its force. It was this which led to the first outbreak of hostilities. Again, in November, we find the Turkish Ministers rejecting a settlement urged on them by Lord Stratford himself, who certainly was actuated by only too friendly motives towards them. It was not till the close of the year that he succeeded in winning their consent to an amended scheme, which Russia cannot be blamed for rejecting, as it really provided no security for the Christians beyond more Turkish promises.

In the face of these facts, Mr. Poole's contention, that the Turks had put themselves entirely in the right, can hardly be admitted. Though, however, we may think that the policy carried out by Lord Stratford was a mistaken one, we cannot refuse our admiration for the energy he displayed in a difficult task, and for his manifest desire to keep the peace if it could be done without admitting the Russian protectorate, which he no doubt honestly believed to be an intolerable evil. We get several pictures of his almost ceaseless labours during the crisis. On Christmas Eve he writes: "I am scribbling all alone in my dressing-gown, in a room full of smoke. I dined alone in the little room—scribble, scribble, scribble, before and after." "I am well, but growing to my chair," he tells his wife at the close of the year.

Into the details of the Crimean War it is not necessary to enter, as the Ambassador's part naturally became somewhat secondary when the pen had given place to the sword. It shows, however, the extraordinary reputation which Lord Stratford had gained, and the almost extravagant opinion generally entertained of his capacity to do anything, that he was expected, in addition to his diplomatic duties, to superintend the military operations. He certainly did a great deal more than could have been reasonably demanded of him in matters which lay without the sphere of his regular duties, but it

was impossible to satisfy every one, and he met with most unfair blame in some quarters for everything that went wrong during the campaign. Mr. Poole shows how unfounded was the charge, alleged by persons who ought to have known better, that the fall of Kars was owing to the Ambassador's negligence in seeing that relief was sent to the garrison.

With the Treaty of Paris, in 1856, Lord Stratford's active labours came almost to an end, though he remained at his post two years longer. He rejoiced at the surrender by Russia of her claim to a protectorate of the Christians of Turkey; but at the same time he did not wish them to be left with nothing but Turkish promises of reform to trust to. He regretted that most unfortunate Article of the Treaty, by which the Powers disclaimed any right of interference in the affairs of the Ottoman Empire. His idea was that, by pressure from without constantly applied, there was still a prospect of compelling the Turks to reform. One would think that his experience might have shown him how little prospect there was of attaining this end; but at least he was not so foolish as to think that mere Turkish professions were of any value when the right of enforcing their fulfilment was disclaimed.

He finally quitted the scene of his activity in 1858, being already what would be considered an old man, though he had still twenty-two years of life before him. The story of these years is cut very short by Mr. Poole, perhaps too short. We might have liked to hear something more of Lord Stratford's views on the renewal of the Eastern Question in 1876-78, as we know from his writings at the time that he had not ceased to take an interest in it. We gather, however, that he had no sympathy with the extreme Turcophile views which were then so loudly expressed in certain quarters, and that his inclinations were in favour of the policy of creating a belt of autonomous Christian States between Turkey and Russia. "He would have welcomed," says his biographer, "the formation of a Christian Empire in place of Turkey, if he could have discovered any Christians fit to rule it." There can be no doubt that if he had lived a few years longer he would have cordially recognized the great progress made by the emancipated Bulgarians in the work of self-government.

Lord Statford de Redcliffe was a nobleman in the best sense of that term: his stainless honour was never impeached; no one could ever bring against him the charge, to which diplomats are generally supposed most liable, of being insincere in his professions, or of uttering words in a double sense. If he had a fault it was that of too great haughtiness and loftiness of manner. This was indeed a quality necessary in dealing with Turks, but it sometimes appears to have shown itself in his relations with his

own countrymen, especially with his official subordinates, whose feelings towards him were rather those of awe than of affection. Taking him all in all, however, he is certainly entitled to rank among the really great Englishmen of the nineteenth century, and the sketch of his life may fitly conclude with the words of Dean Stanley's sermon after his death: "No one could enter into his presence without feeling that they had seen a king of men."

THE DOINGS OF THE METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS.¹

THE issue of a Royal Commission with statutory powers "to inquire into and report upon the working of the Metropolitan Board of Works, and the irregularities alleged to have been connected therewith," can certainly be counted amongst the most important events of the year 1888, seeing that it is likely to be far-reaching both in its influence and results. Without waiting for the Report of the Commission, we are in a position to affirm that the inquiry has exposed the inherent weakness of an indirectly elected authority, and the corruption of several of the members and officers of the Board. Beyond this, it has had the beneficial effect of awakening the hitherto somnolent ratepayers to a greater sense of their responsibility, leading them to demand the extinction of the Board. This demand even a Conservative Government could not resist, and at last London is to have a directly elected Municipal Council, which will, in April 1889, commence the great work that lies before it of securing to this vast metropolis the advantages of good government.

The Metropolitan Board of Works was constituted in 1855 by the Act 18 & 19 Vic. cap. 120, and, but for the fatal mistake which made it representative of the vestries instead of the ratepayers, its thirty-three years of public service, instead of placing it upon its trial, would have made it the first local authority in the kingdom. The Corporation of the City of London, with all its shortcomings, has been powerful, because it was directly representative of the citizens, and its power has been to a great extent sustained by the indirectly representative character of the Metropolitan Board of Works; thus, but for the weaknesses of the Board at Spring Gardens, the "Lord Mayor of London," representing, as he does, only the small area of one square mile (the London of centuries ago), would not now stand before the world as the representative of the five millions of people comprised in the vastly extended area of the London which is the metropolis of England to-day.

¹ *The Working of the Metropolitan Board of Works.* By Mark H. Judge, A.R.I.B.A., Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works Inquiry Committee. Trübner & Co. 1888.—*The Metropolitan Board of Works.* Reprint of Articles and Reports from the *Financial News*. Argus Printing Company. 1888.—*Minutes of Evidence taken on the Metropolitan Board of Works Inquiry Commission*, May 2, 1888, to August 14, 1888. Her Majesty's Stationery Office. 1888.

Of course, the Metropolitan Board of Works, with its large spending powers, could not fail during a period of thirty-three years to effect material improvement in the Metropolis, such as the system of main drainage, the Victoria and Albert Embankments, the creation of new thoroughfares, and the freeing of the bridges from the toll formerly levied; but these works, however satisfactory in themselves (apart from their costliness), could neither condone corruption nor reconcile the ratepayers to the policy of the Board in seeking to ignore their right to a voice in their own affairs.

It is notable that scarcely any large works undertaken by the Board have been carried through without public scandal being raised by charges of corruption against members and officials; charges which would not have been possible had the Board, instead of resorting to privacy in its business, recognized the right of the ratepayers to become acquainted with its proceedings. These charges have been of so serious a nature that from time to time they have provoked official inquiry, both on the part of the Board and of Parliament. But, though damaging to the reputation of the Board, these inquiries were not thorough, and it was reserved for the Royal Commission of 1888 to make known the extent of the mal-administration at Spring Gardens, and thus justify the arraignment of the Board.

The building of the new Pavilion Music Hall must be regarded as the chief circumstance which led to the issue of the Royal Commission of Inquiry. Mr. Mark H. Judge first called the attention of the public to this matter in January 1885, by proposing the following resolution in the Paddington Vestry:—

“That in the opinion of the Vestry of Paddington the Metropolitan Board of Works would have been guilty, under any circumstances, of a breach of trust in disposing, by private treaty, of one of the finest sites at the entrance to the new street to be made between Piccadilly Circus and Bloomsbury, but that in disposing by private treaty of such a site, made valuable by the expenditure of public money, for the purpose of erecting a new London Pavilion Music Hall, the Board merits the severest condemnation; and that, whereas the ground rent of £3000 a year to be paid under this agreement was accepted by the Board with the full knowledge that, without the opportunity of public competition, the Board had received an offer of £4000 a year for the site, Mr. Fardell be requested, in the name of the Vestry, to support every effort that can be legitimately made to prevent the carrying out of so unjust an undertaking.”

As this was the beginning of the agitation which Mr. Judge waged against the Board of Works until the appointment of the Commission three years later, it is worth while to reproduce Mr. Fardell's defence of the Board and Mr. Judge's reply, Mr. Fardell being the representative of the Paddington Vestry on the Board of Works.

He explained that the matter had been decided in Committee, that he had been in the minority in the Committee, but it was only fair that it should be known that Mr. Villiers was an old tenant of the Board, and that the ground-rent was in accordance with a valuation

made by the architect of the Board. The £3000 mentioned in the resolution which Mr. Judge had proposed was not quite a fair statement, as with the £3000 there was to be a premium of £15,000 in addition, which reduced the difference between the price to be paid by Mr. Villiers and the other offer of £4000. He and other members of the Board had opposed the agreement, but the majority had adopted it, and it must stand, whether good or bad.

Mr. Judge alleged that Mr. Fardell had not followed the facts as closely as he might have done. Had he done so he would have explained that, instead of the £3000 carrying a premium of £15,000, the said premium was only to be paid when the new building was licensed for music and dancing. In other words, Mr. Villiers had profited by the failures of the proprietor of the Argyll Rooms, and, instead of employing the usual advocates, he had retained the Metropolitan Board of Works, with whom he had made such excellent terms that the retaining fee (£15,000) was only to be paid in the event of success. He urged, further, that these figures were no criterion of the actual loss the ratepayers would sustain by the contract, which was agreed to *at a private meeting to which all the members of the Board were invited*, and he said that the baneful practice of transacting public business of such a character in the private Committee-room was the greatest blot on the authorities at Spring Gardens, and that it was really discreditable to every member of the Board who consented to be bound in any way by it.

Before voting on this resolution, the Vestry instructed the Clerk to write to the Board of Works to ask whether the facts were as stated by Mr. Judge, and, if so, what reasons could have induced the Board to so dispose of such a prominent site. The reply of the Board was as cool as it was characteristic. The Clerk wrote as follows:—"I am directed to inform you that the question of the disposal of the land referred to in your letter was very fully considered by the Committee, who are authorized by the Board to deal with the surplus lands in its various street improvements, and that in this, as in all instances relating to the disposal of such lands, the Committee acted in the manner which appeared to them the best in the interests of the ratepayers of the Metropolis."

This reply was submitted to the Paddington Vestry on February 17, and the discussion on Mr. Judge's resolution was resumed, with the result that the motion was thrown out by 16 against 11. Mr. Fardell (whose reforming days had not yet dawned) considered this reply was all that the Paddington Vestry could expect, and refused to support the resolution, on the ground that he "did not see that it was the duty of one public body to pass a vote of censure on another Board, which had done what it considered best in the interests of the inhabitants of the Metropolis, and he believed that no member of the Board was actuated by any improper motive."

From this time forward Mr. Judge never lost an opportunity of directing public attention to this and other proceedings of the Board, to which, as a ratepayer, he took exception. We quote the following from one of his letters to the *Times* (September 23, 1885), which aptly illustrates the *modus operandi* employed by the Board :—

“ . . . Those who have witnessed the weekly proceedings of this local Board, which it is to be hoped will never be permitted to celebrate a jubilee, know that the following is an accurate description of what takes place on Fridays at Spring Gardens.

“ A question of difficulty crops up. It is at once, without discussion, resolved to refer the whole matter to the Works and General Purposes Committee. The question is one that must be settled without delay. The Board adjourns; the Press and the public are ushered out of the Board-room. The Board, under the name of the Works and General Purposes Committee, resumes; the knotty point is fully discussed, and a report agreed to. The Committee adjourns, and under the name of the Board it prepares itself to consider and adopt its own report. The Press and the public are again admitted to the solemn conclave. The report is presented. Mr. A. B., a young member of the Board, who did not concur with the decision of the Committee, rises to speak, when the chairman in the severest manner reminds him that he has had every opportunity of discussing the matter in Committee, and appeals to him not to waste the time of the Board by going over the whole question again. While this appeal is being made from the chair, Mr. A. B. is being pulled into his seat, and the report of the Committee is adopted *nem. con.* The time of the Board is saved, but what about the money of the ratepayers? . . . ”

A meeting was held at Willis's Rooms in September 1885, when a public inquiry into the transactions of the Board was advocated. The *Times* published a series of able letters describing a rookery in Marylebone belonging to a member of the Board, which, after being condemned by one of the Board's officers, was repaired by another at the expense of the ratepayers. In October 1886 the *Financial News* entered the lists against the Board, and never flagged in its trenchant attacks, and, in joining in the demand for a public inquiry into the doings of the Board, it offered the following as a solution of the extraordinary feats performed under the *agis* of the Works Committee :—

“ Presumably the members of the Works Committee are innocent as new-born babes of all these Chinese puzzles in the Estate's Office. We do not mean that they came into the world yesterday, or even the day before; but they have a wonderfully ingenuous way of looking over their spectacles and seeing nothing. Elderly gentlemen often have. At every meeting of the Board the Works Committee submits a series of recommendations that such and such agreements be sealed, or that certain modifications be made, or that certain other conditions be refused. At longer intervals there comes up a report bearing the statutory half-dozen signatures. We observed that one of them, which occurred very frequently, belonged to a practising architect. Another was that of the reputed owner of a weekly newspaper, which lives on Metropolitan Board advertisements. This gentleman's son, we are told, ‘holds the plate’ for the advertisements; but where the plate is emptied into afterwards is a domestic secret. We

would not for the world intrude on the privacy of the editorial hearth. The rest of the half-dozen are generally persons of the kind who pride themselves on being practical men. We have had some experience of 'practical men,' and this we can safely say of them, that, if they have the choice of grinding two axes, their own or somebody else's, it is their own which is most likely to be ground.

"To judge from the minutes of the Metropolitan Board of Works, its Estate's Office—the most important of all its administrative departments—receives the least attention of any from the general body of the members. It has been for years in the hands of a small clique of about a dozen members and two or three officials. This clique has had the giving away of millions' worth of Metropolitan property, and it has never till now been asked, either inside the Board or outside of it, to render an intelligible account of its stewardship."

The demand for an inquiry gathered strength, Mr. Fardell and other members of the Board eventually giving their adhesion to it, and this led to an inquiry being instituted by the Board itself, Mr. James Beal and others who had made charges against the Board being invited to make good their charges. They all declined the invitation, on the ground that the Board was not a competent tribunal to inquire into the charges made against itself. Mr. Judge had not been invited, but he was present at the inquiry, in the public gallery, and came forward voluntarily to give evidence. He expressed his astonishment and regret that gentlemen who had publicly made charges against the Board had not come forward with the evidence on which their charges were based. He agreed that the inquiry would have to go further, and be made by an independent body, but he considered that any inquiry was a step in the right direction. As one who had made charges against the Board, he felt bound to come forward with the evidence on which the charges were based, and he submitted particulars justifying his censure of the conduct of the Board in disposing of the Pavilion site to Mr. Villiers. Mr. Judge was cross-examined by Mr. Meadows White, Q.C., but was not shaken in his testimony that the public lands of the Board had been disposed of improperly, and that certain individuals who were favoured with information with regard to the disposal of certain land were able to make a market of it at the public cost.

The action of Mr. Judge in volunteering evidence was a surprise to the Committee, and, as it was followed by several other witnesses presenting themselves, the Committee, consisting of the whole Board, refused to hear any witnesses other than those who had been invited, and then actually resolved *nem. con.* :—

"That the Committee do report its proceedings to the Board, and state that, although the fullest publicity has been given to the inquiry, and every opportunity given to persons able and willing to give information to the Committee, no one has come forward to substantiate the statements made in the newspapers and in a vestry, as to the conduct of officials and members of the Board in relation to the sale of the Board's lands."

It would be difficult to find a parallel for this audacious attempt on the part of a public board to whitewash itself. But it was too patent for the shallowest capacity to be deceived by it, and, instead of satisfying the public, it only added energy to the movement against the Board. The Metropolitan Board of Works Inquiry Committee was formed at a meeting at St. James's Hall, with Mr. Judge as chairman, to demand the appointment of a Royal Commission of Inquiry, while inside the Board itself a minority of the members, led by Mr. Fardell, also advocated the appointment of a Commission. The Paddington Vestry gave its unanimous support to Mr. Judge and Mr. Fardell; the majority of the other vestries and district boards of the Metropolis followed on the same side; Lord Randolph Churchill was induced to move for the appointment of a Commission; the Government acquiesced in the motion, and, in April 1888, Lord Herschell, Mr. F. A. Bosanquet, Q.C., and Mr. H. R. Grenfell were appointed Commissioners "to inquire into and report upon the working of the Metropolitan Board of Works and the irregularities which are alleged to have taken place in connection therewith."

The Commissioners have held twenty-four public sittings, extending from May 2 to August 14, when they adjourned *sine die*. Mr. H. Winch, Q.C., Mr. J. P. Grain, and Mr. E. F. Studd, instructed by Messrs. Kaye and Guedalla, appeared, by special leave of the Commissioners, as counsel on behalf of the Metropolitan Board of Works Inquiry Committee, and Mr. Meadows White, Q.C., and Mr. G. M. Freeman, instructed by Mr. Wood, appeared as counsel for the Metropolitan Board of Works. Lord Herschell presided at every sitting of the Commission, and examined the whole of the witnesses, the work of counsel on both sides being confined to cross-examination.

The evidence obtained by the Commissioners was very voluminous and most important, and, though the daily press gave lengthy reports of the proceedings each day, it will not be superfluous to reproduce some specimens of it as recorded in the official minutes of the Commission, particularly now that the Report of the Commission is about to be published and the election of the London County Council is occupying the attention of the ratepayers.

Mr. W. R. Selway, member of the Board since 1873, gave evidence on several occasions. He admitted that the Board had an offer of an additional £1000 a year ground rent for the Pavilion site, over and above the £3000 offered by Mr. Villiers, and that this offer of £4000 was not further considered than that it was read. He was strongly opposed to the rebuilding of the music-hall, but the Board having decided to sell the land for this purpose, he voted for Mr. Villiers being allowed to have it for the £3000. As was usual in such cases the whole matter was arranged by the Works and General Purposes Committee, consisting of the whole Board, and when the Committee

reported to the Board, and the matter became public, he was of opinion that they were morally bound to Mr. Villiers. Mr. Alderman Saunders was a member of the Board, and it was known to the other members that he was the architect whom Mr. Villiers had engaged for building the new Pavilion. In his cross-examination by Mr. Winch, he answered several questions relative to the character of Mr. Villiers, and these were succeeded by the following questions and answers:—

597. (*Mr. Winch.*) Were any other inquiries made with regard to his financial position as a tenant at £3000 a year?—Yes; inquiries seem to have been made.

598. With what result? Do not hesitate. I have got it all here in black and white, and have had it vouched?—I had better read the portion of the solicitor's report which refers to that. It is the latter part.

599. I would not put this question with regard to Mr. Villiers on the last occasion until the public records had been searched to see that I was on perfectly safe grounds. Was it not the fact that in 1877 Mr. Villiers filed a petition for liquidation of his affairs, that those affairs were finally liquidated in 1884, and that he paid nothing in the pound upon £16,000 of debts. Was not that his position in 1884?—I find the solicitor reported that he had obtained his discharge. What he paid I do not know.

600. (*Chairman.*) You had better read it out. There seems to be no mention of what he paid?—That is what I thought. After speaking of the sureties, the solicitor goes on to say, "I think it right to inform the Committee that I have had some inquiry and search made against Mr. Villiers and his proposed sureties. I do not find anything against the sureties, but I find that Mr. Villiers presented a petition for liquidation of his affairs in May 1877, his secured debts amounting to £34,862, his unsecured debts being £15,675, against assets amounting to £5242. The estate is, I believe, still in the hands of trustees, but Mr. Villiers obtained his discharge in July 1877."

601. (*Mr. Winch.*) That is correct as far as it goes. The inquiry did not go further?—No.

602. If it had been brought down to the time, I think you would have ascertained, as the fact was, that there was no dividend paid at all. You had that before you, I understand, when you agreed to grant Mr. Villiers in 1884 or 1885 a lease of this piece of land at £3000 a year?—No doubt.

603. (*Mr. Meadows White.*) What is the date of that report?—The 28th July 1879.

604. (*Mr. Winch.*) You had also at the same time an offer from Mr. Pyke of £4000 a year?—Yes; I went into that yesterday.

Mr. Alderman Saunders, member of the Board from 1862 to 1888, was examined on four occasions. The whole of his evidence was an admission that he had used his position at the Board to advance his pecuniary interests. The following are some of the questions, with his replies, put to this present Magistrate of the City of London and ex-member of the Metropolitan Board of Works:—

1552. (*Chairman.*) What did your 5 per cent. amount to [in connection with the Pavilion]?—I should think £1800 or £1900.

1553. Out of that Mr. Worley [Joint Architect] got £150?—He did.

1554. No more?—No more.

1555. Was that £1800 entirely yours, or did you share any portion of that beyond the £150 with any one else?—I gave £200 to Mr. Woodward

[District Surveyor under the Board of Works], who had introduced it to me, and in consideration of certain advice he had given upon it, and the introduction. Beyond that, I gave not a penny to anybody.

* * * * *

1688. (*Mr. Grain.*) Will you follow me on this question of remuneration. Will you tell us what was the sum you actually made for your professional services to the Grand Hotel, roughly; you say it was divided equally?—I think the total was something under £5000.

1689. Your share?—No; my share would be half of that.

1690. You received about half of £5000?—Yes.

1691. Now, could you give me the same answer to the same question as regards the Hôtel Métropole?—The Hôtel Métropole was a fixed fee.

1692. What was your portion?—My amount would be about £1200.

* * * * *

1738. Were you architect for any one of the theatres?—No.

* * * * *

1760. May I take it that you had been a party, as a member of the Theatres Committee, to settling the alterations that were required by the Board in the Criterion Theatre?—No. If I had ever reported upon the thing, as far as I know, I never took any part in it, but, if I had, it would have rather facilitated that which the Board would have wished.

1761. I want to clearly understand. You say you were not a party to any of the arrangements made by the Theatres Committee in respect of the Criterion?—I should think I was.

1762. Then, after having been a party in that way, what fee did you receive from Messrs. Spiers and Pond for the advice you gave in conjunction with Mr. Verity in regard to the Criterion?—I received 100 guineas.

1763. Is that the whole connection you had with the Criterion, as regards alterations; I am not speaking of building now?—I believe so.

1764. (*Chairman.*) Surely you must have remembered about the Criterion. Your memory seemed entirely to have gone as to what theatres you had to deal with, or whether you had any, and now you have a good recollection of the Criterion?—I did not grasp the questions put at all. I would have answered it at once if I had.

* * * * *

1852. Have you a copy of the report you made to Mr. Hobson?—I made no report.

1853. You gave him the advice by word of mouth?—By word of mouth.

1854. It was a very large fee, was it not, for advising by word of mouth as to how many years' purchase a man should give for a ground rent?—It is what our professional fees run to.

1855. Do you mean to represent that for simply advising a leaseholder at £500 or £600 a year how many years' purchase he should offer, £100 would be the ordinary professional charge?—It would be the fee.

1856. Did you ever get it in any other case?—I think so; in several.

1857. Can you name any one?—I do not know that I can at the present moment.

* * * * *

1884. (*Mr. Grain.*) Was an action brought by Mr. Isaacs against Mr. Villiers?—There was an occasion on which Mr. Villiers mentioned it.

1885. What was the action by Isaacs against Villiers—what was it for?—For apparently Mr. Villiers having called upon Mr. Isaacs—

1886. What was the form of the action. Was it not for a fee of 100 guineas or 120 guineas for preparing plans for the purpose of placing before the Board?—I have no knowledge of that.

1887. You know something about the action?—No.

* * * * *

1892. (*Mr. Grain.*) Was the action settled?—I believe so.

1893. Did you pay the costs?—I paid the costs.

* * * * *

1918. To whom did you pay that—to Mr. Villiers?—No; I paid that to Mr. Goddard [the Board's Valuing Surveyor].

1919. What, may I ask, had Mr. Goddard to do with this action of Isaacs v. Villiers?—I do not know, excepting that Mr. Goddard was settling that action, so I understood, for Mr. Villiers.

1920. (*Chairman.*) Where did you make the payment?—I think I paid it one day when I attended at the Board. Oh, yes, Mr. Goddard asked me whether it was not worth while, as a matter of feeling with Mr. Isaacs, to pay the money, and so I did it.

Mr. L. H. Isaacs, architect, testified to having been engaged by Mr. Villiers as architect for the new music-hall, and said that in accordance with instructions received he prepared plans and obtained a firm of builders to carry out the works. He was subsequently superseded by Mr. Saunders, and had to sue Mr. Villiers for the amount due for services rendered. In answer to question 2802 by the chairman, Mr. Isaacs said:—

“On the 20th January. ‘Further interview for the like purpose,’ [Entry in diary.] Then Mr. Villiers ceased to call. I thought it desirable to know how the matter stood, and I called upon him at the London Pavilion and saw him. He told me that very considerable pressure had been put upon him, pressure so direct that he could not possibly set it aside, and that he had been compelled to engage the services of a Mr. Saunders, a member of the Board. I felt very indignant, and asked him for an explanation. He said that it had been pointed out to him that time was the essence of his contract with the Board of Works; that he was allowed only a very short period of time to erect the building, so as to secure his lease, and that failure on his part to complete by that time would result in the loss of his building agreement and all the money he might have spent in covering the ground, and that it had been pointed out to him that in order to save time, or to gain the necessary time to put up the building, it was of the utmost consequence that the drawings for the proposed new structure should receive the sanction of the Board without any delay, and that the only way in which that could be done was to engage the services of the gentleman whom he subsequently employed as his architect.”

Mr. R. C. Villiers, the proprietor of the Pavilion Music Hall, admitted having appointed Mr. Alderman Saunders as his architect, under pressure, and also that he had corrupted Mr. Goddard and Mr. Robertson, the Board's surveyors. The following are some of the choice contributions of this witness to the unveiling of the secret doings at Spring Gardens:—

In answer to question 3756 by the chairman, as to the bribe given to Mr. Goddard, Mr. Villiers said:—

Mr. Dunch and I arranged that we were to offer him £50 a quarter, or £200 per annum.

3757. I believe Mr. Dunch shortly after that reported that he had given Mr. Goddard a £50 note for the first of those payments?—Yes.

3758. And that Goddard would take £50 a quarter?—He did take it.

3759. Did he receive from you £50 a quarter during the whole of that tenancy, down to the demolition of the old Pavilion?—From Mr. Dunch.

3760. You making the payment through Mr. Dunch?—I returning it to Mr. Dunch.

3761. So that he received, during the whole of those six years, from you, £200 a year?—Yes.

3762. During the time of your tenancy did you see Goddard from time to time?—Yes.

3763. Did he give you information with reference to what would be the site of the new building?—Yes.

3764. I believe at that time Mr. Grey was the owner of the "Black Horse" public-house, adjoining the London Pavilion?—He was the tenant.

3765. You were acquainted with him?—He frequently came into the Pavilion, and we were in the habit of having conversations.

3766. Did you know at that time that he was the brother of Mr. Robertson, who was in the architect's office?—I was not aware of it at that early period.

* * * * *

3851. Did he [Mr. Robertson] say that Saunders would never stand Isaacs and Florence being the architects?—He said, "They are not friends, and I do not think you will get any support from Mr. Saunders if Isaacs and Florence are the architects."

3852. Then you took Robertson on one side?—Then I took Robertson on one side, and I said, "Well, this is awkward; what are we to do?" He shook his head and said, "I am sorry for it, but I do not see that you have any alternative; he will spoil you; you had better go down." I went down with Mr. Woodward to Mr. Saunders, in Finsbury Circus, and I was introduced to Mr. Saunders by Mr. Woodward.

3853. What did Mr. Saunders say?—He appeared, if I may so express it, a sort of surprised, but at the same time expecting it.

3854. What did he say?—He said, "Oh, then, you have come to me yourself now; how are we going to manage this? You see it is very awkward. I cannot vote for you, but there are more ways of killing a cat than hanging it." I said, "Yes, I see that, Mr. Saunders." He said, "Well, let us see; am I to understand I am to be your architect?" "Well," I said, "you must be." He said, "Very well then, we will see what we can do. I shall send you a letter in due course, and we will go into this matter afterwards." That is the way it was concluded. Of course the conversation was more elaborate and elongated, but that was the purport of it.

* * * * *

3880. In December 1886, I believe you sold the London Pavilion to a Company?—Yes.

3881. And received payment, part in debentures?—Part in debentures, and part in cash.

3882. Did you give Goddard £5000 of those debentures?—Yes.

3883. What was that for?—That was for his assistance in obtaining the site, and for his previous services and supervision—what I considered his supervision of the place, as he was the custodian or censor of the place.

3884. You had not made him any of the £200 a year payments afterwards?—Yes, when the place opened I made two. I think I made £100 and £50. I continued that when the new place opened.

Mr. Villiers put in evidence a number of private letters which he had received from Mr. Goddard since the formation of the Inquiry Committee. In one of these letters, dated February 23, he wrote (3912):—

"I was gratified by the receipt of your letter, and will get you the extracts and reports you wish for. If our friend had bowed his head to the storm, and had accepted the vote of modified censure, he might have got through, but he filed his statutory declaration and practically defied the Board. In the meantime all sorts of incriminatory matters were scattered abroad in his connection with Statham Hobson, and some members were determined to get rid of him. On Monday he was given a fortnight to send in his resignation, and I believe he now intends to do so, and goes to Australia at the end of next month.

"The Commission may be appointed during next month, but it cannot be earlier. You speak of their sending for you. I sketched out your answer:—

" 'I'm here at Mentone in comfort and peace,
My Pavilion connection has happened to cease,
The Commission may sit as long as it pleases,
My comfort and health are more than its breezes,
To dear Randy Pandy I wish to be civil,
He can see me out here or go to the devil.'

"I need not say I am not in comfort or peace, and shall be very glad when it is over."

In his answer (3912) Mr. Villiers said of these letters of Mr. Goddard's . . . "his letters so alarmed me that I determined there was nothing to do but to come and give evidence."

On March 1 Mr. Goddard wrote:—

"With regard to R., he tells me he has packed up, and is ready to start at once with the honorarium in black mail of £1000 extorted from me. Both Reid and Driver will support the price paid; so far so good."

Mr. Goddard was never examined, two medical men having certified that at the time he was summoned before the Commission it would have been dangerous to his life for him to attend.

Mr. Robertson did present himself for examination, and admitted having introduced his brothers, under the name of Grey, to properties of the Board, but his evidence was of so unsatisfactory a character that the Commission ordered him to submit his bank-books and accounts for inspection. He failed to come up for further examination until after the Commission had obtained copies of his bank-books from his bankers, and then his offer to come forward was refused. Thus, the Commission are at present precluded from giving certificates to either Goddard or Robertson.

Mr. F. H. Fowler, member of the Board since 1868, was examined on four days, and, after a great deal of beating about the bush, he acknowledged that there were a number of cases in which he had used his position at the Board in the same manner as Mr. Alderman Saunders had done.

Mr. W. Bradley, one of the Board's surveyors, admitted having done business on his own account by purchasing, privately, property which he knew would be required by the Board for street improvements, and of selling the same to the Board at a profit, the Board buying on a valuation in which he acted as its valuation surveyor.

Several auctioneers, surveyors, and land investors confessed to

having bribed officials of the Board, while architects, who had not offered bribes, testified to the great difficulty and delay they experienced in getting their plans passed by the Board.

The evidence which was given in connection with the contracts for the Thames Embankments should be read and pondered by all who wish to understand the doings of the members of the Metropolitan Board of Works. Mr. George Furness, contractor, gave such evidence as the following:—

12,858. (*Mr. Winch.*) Let me read your letter. It was in connection with Mr. Roche. You recollect this: "On the morning the contract was to be let, Mr. Roche, the member for Paddington, met us at the offices in Spring Gardens, and asked me into one of the committee-rooms, when he promised to support me for the contract if I would enter into an agreement to have all the granite from the Lundy Granite Company." That is a letter signed by you. Is that correct?—The contract was entered into at the time I went in the closet. My statements there before the Metropolitan Board that you are taking I am prepared to swear to. I have not read them since."

12,859. Let me read them to you. "On the morning the contract was to be let, Mr. Roche, the member for Paddington, met us at the offices in Spring Gardens, and asked me into one of the committee-rooms, when he promised to support me for the contract if I would enter into an agreement to have all the granite from the Lundy Granite Company." At that time you had not got the contract?—No, I had not, then.

12,860. "This I agreed to do, provided the granite were approved by the engineer; and he wrote out a contract, which he wished me to sign. This I did, and by it I undertook to have all the granite from the Lundy quarries, in which he, I believe, was interested." Did you know that Mr. Roche was interested in the Lundy Granite Company?—He was. I do not know the interest he had. He was advocating the contract.

12,861. It is in another part of your evidence that you say you were locked in the room with him?—That is true.

12,862. And Mr. Roche insisted on it. He was then a member of the Board?—He was. I stated that before the Board. What I stated there I am perfectly prepared to swear to at the present time, although I could not remember it all.

Mr. Charles Mills Roche, late member of the Board for Paddington, while denying the accuracy of the account which Mr. Furness had given, admitted (1) having prepared agreements binding the contractors to take the Lundy granite; (2) that he acted as solicitor to the Lundy Granite Company; and (3) that the said agreements were prepared and signed by two different contractors before the Board had decided which tender it would accept. Mr. Roche's "explanation" occupies thirteen pages of the official minutes!

Enough evidence has been quoted to vindicate the position of those who struggled so long against, and in spite of, the many obstructions put in their way by those in power, to get a thorough overhauling of the transactions of the Metropolitan Board of Works, and it is a curiously striking illustration of the deplorable apathy of the ratepayers of the Metropolis that, although the central fact with regard to the Pavilion Music Hall was made the subject of an indig-

nation public meeting at Willis's Rooms, called by those who strongly felt the impropriety of the whole transaction, so long ago as September 1885, it nevertheless took three more years of persistent agitation to give the *quietus* to Lord Magheramorne and his colleagues in their public protests, constantly reiterated, both on business and festive occasions, that the charges brought against the Board were utterly groundless.

Lord Herschell and the other members of the Commission have rendered a signal service to the Metropolis by the thorough way in which they have thus far done the work entrusted to them. It remains, however, to be seen whether in their report they have had the courage, and, it may be added, a true sense of the duties of citizenship, to stigmatize as such deeds deserve, not only the evil doings which have been brought to light, but the secret policy of the Board, by which, as we have shown, they were alone made possible.

In conclusion we must give our meed of praise to the Inquiry Committee, and especially to Mr. Mark H. Judge, at whose instance it was formed and under whose chairmanship it has acted throughout. The ratepayers of the Metropolis have not only to thank the Inquiry Committee for the appointment of the Commission, but for the thorough manner in which they arranged for the interests of the ratepayers being represented at the Inquiry. How thoroughly this was effected may be judged from the concluding remarks of Lord Herschell at the last sitting of the Commission, when he said: "Before adjourning, the Commission desire to thank all who have assisted them in their inquiry. They would especially express their obligations to the solicitors of the Inquiry Committee for the care with which they have investigated some of the many communications which the Commissioners have received." These are no small services for a voluntary Committee to have rendered to a Royal Commission, and doubtless Parliament will in some way mark its sense of it.

WHY IS SCOTLAND LIBERAL?

At every election since the Reform Bill of 1832, Liberal opinions have prevailed at the polls in Scotland. Sometimes the Liberal majority has been overwhelming, at other times less considerable, but always substantial; and the representatives have fairly reflected the opinions of the constituencies, for in no part of the United Kingdom of the same size and importance have democratic opinions prevailed for so considerable a period. It is, perhaps, due to this fact that Scotland has been chosen as the battle-ground on which recent political campaigns have been carried on. The Conservative leaders frequently attacking the citadel of their opponents' power—and the Liberal leaders returning to repel the attack, and to receive encouragement from the enthusiasm of their followers—both acknowledge Scotland to be the stronghold of Liberalism. If this be so, it may be worth considering for a little whether we can find an answer to the question—Why is Scotland Liberal?

At a very early period the views of the great Scottish political thinkers were very advanced. The complete supremacy of the Crown had been prevented by the enormous power of the Barons, and the constant struggle between the two forces hindered the consolidation of the government. The national constitution lacked fixity, because there was no single power dominant over all the others. The natural result was that politicians could speculate on the principles of government with greater freedom in Scotland than in a country where the sovereign power was recognized to exist in one body and the methods of government had been formulated with exactness. George Buchanan in his work, *De jure Regni*, written for the instruction of his royal pupil, James VI., laid down that all power, even that of the king, was derived from the people, and was to be exercised for the general welfare, that it was granted only under certain restrictions, and that it was lawful for the people to resist tyrants. These doctrines, however commonplace they may seem now, were very far in advance of his time. He was followed by some of the reformers, who in their struggle with the government set forth doctrines which to the statesmen of the period must have seemed almost revolutionary.

Undoubtedly, however, the Scottish people first acquired a position of political influence subsequent to the Reformation period. Prior to that time the whole power in the State was wielded by the Crown and

Barons. Each of these strove to gain the support of the Church in the contest with the other. But the mass of the people was not recognized as possessing any controlling voice. The towns were too small and poor to produce a powerful middle class of the burgher type, and the people in the country were ranged under their feudal superiors, whose commands they were bound to obey. But they sprang into independent power in the State during the conflict between the Reformed Church and the Crown. The reforming party in the Church, with the help of the nobles, subverted the Romish Church and established in its place the Protestant faith. But the reformed clergy, deserted by the nobility in the succeeding struggle with the Crown, flung themselves on the people, who cordially supported them; and as the contest went on the issues gradually broadened until they embraced the question of the civil rights of the people as against the royal prerogative. The triumph of the clergy thus meant the triumph also of democracy in Scotland, and so fierce had been the struggle that the principles maintained during it were indelibly stamped on the minds of the people. However willing in religious matters the Scottish people might be to submit to the dominion of the clergy, in civil matters their opinions, whenever expressed, were essentially democratic.

The common remark about the Scotch is that they are specially fond of metaphysical speculation. They attempt, it is said, to reduce everything to principle, from which they argue with logical exactness. If this be true, one can understand that, in politics, the position of a Scotchman would be more or less that of a doctrinaire. He would expect any course that was proposed to him in the management of the affairs of the nation to be justified by an appeal to theory. Buckle, in his very interesting chapter on Scotland in the *History of Civilization*, has pointed out the essentially deductive character of the Scottish intellect. The influence of the clergy over the people had been so great and long-continued that they had moulded the intellect of the nation into their own forms of thought, which were necessarily deductive. The clergy accepted the principles from which they reasoned as from an inspired source, which it was impious to doubt, and from which they constructed their whole system of theology and morals by a process of logical dialectic. Composed on this plan, their long discourses, from which it was considered a sin, if it was not an offence punishable by the civil magistrate, for any one to absent himself—gradually trained the Scottish people in the same method of reasoning. So great was their influence that even when the higher intellects during last century revolted against the religious despotism, the system which the philosophers and scientists followed was still the deductive one which they had received from their religious teachers. Buckle has pointed out that this method deprived them of the hold of the popular mind, because the people are seldom capable of understanding a course of high speculation

depending on the logical application of great principles. The more popular way would have been to ascend inductively from particulars easily intelligible to the more general propositions. Scotland therefore, during the last century, presented the curious contrast of high speculation and advanced theories indulged in by a few minds, and the greatest superstition among the mass of the people. At the same time, it can scarcely be doubted that when the public mind was roused by any political question of importance, the people would naturally apply to it the same method of reasoning to which they had been accustomed by their religious and intellectual teachers. They would naturally seek some principle which would help them to solve the difficulty. The appeal would be not so much to experience or expediency, but to the true rule, according to the political theory of the time, which applied to the circumstances. Hence to some extent the doctrinaire character of the Scottish mind. The spirit of inquiry, of critical examination and distrust of authority which had been engendered and developed in spiritual affairs during the Reformation period, readily adapted itself to political questions. And if once a people cease to admire institutions for their age and former renown, but call on them to justify their existence by the laws of political science, the tendency must be to improvement and change.

We are now in a position to observe how the Scottish people, examining, adopting, or rejecting the political principles submitted to them, settled into democratic methods, and to trace the influences which have tended to keep Liberal opinions alive. In the first place, it is to be noted that politics in Scotland, during the present century, have not been disturbed by any enthusiasm for measures dealing exclusively with Scottish affairs. The Church questions, which aroused enormous interest at one time, after the first appeal to the Government, were withdrawn from the political field, and were left to be fought out by the people themselves. It is true that they have lately been the subject of political agitation once more, but their influence on political life at the middle of this century was not so great as might have been expected from the enormous importance they had in the eyes of the people. The land question did not excite much attention, for this reason, that the agricultural interest was fairly prosperous; and the crofter question, although it had already attracted some notice, had not come to the front.

The best method of approaching the question, is to ask what are the great supports of Conservatism in England? We find they are three. 1. The exclusive or class character of the higher education; 2. The Church; and 3. The influence of the landed aristocracy. Let us look at the conditions of these influences in the two countries, and we shall find in the important differences of their character much that will explain the resulting contrast in political thinking.

1. Education.—Until recently (if not at present) the best educated minds in England were trained at the great public schools (Eton, Harrow, &c.) and in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Every one who hoped to enter one of the learned professions and sought the best preparation for success in them, and all those who were born to positions of rank and wealth, and sought the culture necessary for the discharge of high functions, entered one of these schools in their boyhood, and passed from them to the University by a regular and acknowledged sequence. But all these institutions, however thorough in their training, can only be entered by the wealthy. Each of them requires for the payment of fees and for the maintenance of the student resources which make it impossible for any but the comparatively rich to study there. The money often expended on a boy at these schools would be considered a comfortable income by many clergymen with a family. Thus at Harrow, according to the author of *Our Schools and Colleges*, the students, with the exception of a few privileged ones, reside in the masters' houses "at rates varying from £109 to £176, including schooling, besides £16 entrance fees, &c." The other schools are not so expensive, but yet are quite beyond the reach of any but the well-to-do. The same thing may be said of the Universities. The author of the book above mentioned says: "The cost of a career at Oxford depends to a great extent upon the habits of the student. The University Commissioners estimated it recently at about £600, but it has been shown that, with economy, half that sum may be made to suffice. £400 would be ample for one of moderate means and wants." On the other hand, Mr. A. M. M. Stedman, M.A., Wadham College, in the recently published book, *Oxford: Its Life and Schools*, says: "For instance, it is said that a man with proper care and economy may live at a college for £120 a year, and pass through his career to his degree for little over £300. The statement is fallacious." After going into the question in detail he winds up with the statement: "In conclusion. If the cost of a man's career from his matriculation to his M.A. cost him no more than £570 as a pass man, or £700 as an honour man, he may certainly be congratulated on the result." Whichever of these views is correct, it is quite certain that, like the schools, the Universities must be entered by the use of a golden key. The poor man, except in very rare cases, must resign all hope of their scholastic training and culture. Learning is gradually regarded as the prerogative of wealth, and the rich man is respected not only for his wealth, but for the mental endowments which it has procured for him. One cannot fail to see what an enormous influence such a system gives to the upper classes in England. The abler intellects among the masses are the first to recognize their inferiority to those who have such splendid advantages. Naturally the former in political matters defer to the opinions of the latter as their intellectual superiors. Unquestionably, therefore, the

exclusive character of the higher education in England must have been in times past a solid support to Conservatism in politics.

In Scotland, on the other hand, the best schools and the Universities are open to and taken advantage of by all classes of the people. Indeed, there are few schools even yet, and none till quite recently, of the kind which in England occupies the space between the initiatory school and the University. The Scotch boy remains at the school where he learnt the rudiments of knowledge till the time when, should he wish to prosecute his studies further, he enters the University. Except for a few modern instances, there are no schools in Scotland in the position of Harrow, Eton, &c., in England. Here, then, we have to notice the important fact that there are no schools in Scotland, recognized as national institutions, such as those in England, providing an education of the highest class and restricted, by the cost of attending them, to the aristocratic or wealthy classes. There is absent from secondary education in Scotland an element of social distinction which exists in England. In the University, again, the same thing may be observed. The students do not reside within the walls of the college, and the superintendence of the governing body over the students does not extend beyond the institution itself. The Scotch student lives where he pleases and how he pleases. He may live in a garret, on the coarsest of fare and clothed in the plainest of dress, and no one can interfere with him. His only expense, apart from the purchase of books and his own maintenance, is the payment of fees to the University; and as these fees are small they need form no barrier to the entrance of the comparatively poor within its walls. The biographies of many of Scotland's most eminent men record their struggles to obtain the advantages of the University in the midst of poverty. Take, for example, the case of Thomas Carlyle, whose life has recently attracted the attention of the whole English-speaking world. Every one knows how hard was the struggle of his father and mother, and how great his own poverty while he attended Edinburgh University. Alluding to this topic, Mr. Gladstone, in the Rectorial address delivered to the University of Glasgow, in December 1879, says:—

“Of the 590 students” (in the Humanity Class) “who may be taken, I understand, fairly to represent the average of the University, about one-third, or more exactly 199, are so far independent in their means that they are not diverted from their academic work by any other occupation. But there are no less than 391, or two-thirds of the whole, who keep their place in the University absolutely, or almost in every case, by one form or another of private employment added on, through the whole or a portion of the year, to the burden of their studies. Two hundred and forty-one are thus engaged in extraneous work, both during the session and through the summer. One hundred and thirty-five, without doubling their task during the session, are variously employed through the summer. The remaining sixteen join a business to their academic pursuits during the winter. The intending lawyers are clerks in writers' offices, the

teachers to be, and others, are employed in teaching, and some as pupils in the training colleges. Some youths are exercised in mission work. 'The remainder,' says Professor Ramsay, 'are distributed over every conceivable kind of employment. In the Humanity Class this year are included joiners, miners, brassfounders, bootmakers, tailors, grocers, engineers, shipbuilders, drapers, stewards of steamers, a toll-keeper,' who may, I suppose, well be said to levy toll first of all upon himself, 'a pocket-book-maker, a blacksmith,' with others."

Let us remember, also, how wide the higher education in Scotland, such as it is, is spread among the people. Scotland, with a population of $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions, sends yearly over 6500 students to the University. Within the walls of the college there never have been the social distinctions which prevailed at one time in the English Universities. Every student is on the same footing socially as far as the University is concerned. Now the effect of this widespread and cheap higher education is, that the learned man in Scotland is not assumed to be of the higher classes, for in the majority of cases he is not. He as likely as not is one of the masses, sympathizing with them in their views and participating in their welfare. His own immediate interests, and those of the people dearest to him, are not those of the aristocracy, but of the general mass of the people, including the poorer classes. Thus, while in England the influence of learning is toward aristocratic or class government, or Conservatism, its influence in Scotland is towards democratic government, or Liberalism. In the one country the able man among the masses is met by an opponent fully disciplined by the best intellectual training the country can afford, and who, therefore, frequently compels him to acknowledge his inferiority; in the other, he is aided by men of his own class as well as the higher, whose mental discipline is of the best in the land. The Liberalism of Scotland is clearly maintained and stimulated by the character and wide embrace of the national system of education.

2. The Church.—There are two influences which tend to maintain the aristocratic or class attitude of the clergy in the Church of England—viz., the nature of the higher education there, which has been alluded to, and the system of patronage. Any one who hopes for preferment on taking holy orders, must prepare himself for his duties by attending one of the Universities, whose gates, we have seen, are only opened by the golden key. Of course every clergyman of the Church of England has not enjoyed the advantage of such an education; but few of those who have not are beneficed, and fewer still, if any, attain high preferment. This is due partly to the large Church patronage in the hands of the Universities, which makes them a leading avenue to success in the clerical profession; partly to the prejudice in favour of an University education; and partly to the wealth of the majority of patrons, which enables them to send those of their dependents whom they design for benefices to the Universities. The class, there-

fore, from which the clergy who direct the currents of thought in the Church are drawn, is the moneyed and upper class. Patronage, again, very obviously tends in the same direction. The patron who has a living at his disposal, finds here an opportunity of making provision for some of the junior members of his family at a very cheap rate. The family living is almost as continuously occupied by a member of the same aristocratic race as the family seat itself. If, however, by some mischance there is no relative ready to fill it, the patron looks out for a clergyman as nearly as possible of his own social status. The friendly interchange of good offices between the hall and the parsonage is so frequent that, for his own comfort, the squire thinks it necessary to have a member of his own class in the living. The parson is completely identified with the squire and his interest. The clergy accordingly belong to, or are dependent upon, the aristocracy of birth or wealth, and share their opinions and sympathize with their feelings.

Let us look now at the form of Church government. Till recently the laity had no voice in the management of Church affairs. The whole administrative and doctrinal questions in the Church were discussed and settled in the Houses of Convocation, in which no layman had the right to appear. The clergy, forming a distinct order in the State, had the sole power of managing the most important of all human affairs. Within the Church the ranks and degrees are various and of serious difference: the curate, the beneficed clergyman, the rural dean, the residentiary canon, the dean, the bishop, and archbishop. The Church is really a kingdom within the nation (*Imperium in imperio*), with the Sovereign for supreme head, with the bishops for its spiritual peers, and with various orders of more or less aristocratic rank. The effect of such an institution on its rulers, and through them on its members, can scarcely be other than anti-democratic, because it maintains a pattern of class supremacy before the public mind. The whole system presents a model, not of republican simplicity and equality, but of ranks and degrees, which, translated into society at large, correspond very much to the class differences which Conservatism seeks to perpetuate. The closest adherents of the establishment naturally desire to prevent all change of a serious character even in spheres totally unconnected with ecclesiastical affairs; for they fear that, if these changes take place outside the Church, the spirit of innovation may spread within its borders. The forces which the Church has at its command are therefore directed towards the maintenance of the present order of things; and these forces are enormous. With an organization elaborated through centuries by the most talented minds in the kingdom, with splendid revenues from different sources, with the prestige due to the recognition and support of the Government, and numbering among its adherents the most powerful men of the time, the influence of the Church on the national

life for good or evil can scarcely be exaggerated. Now this force is, for the reasons which have been already given, largely thrown into the Conservative scale. Although there are many Liberals among the English clergy, yet as an institution the Church is anti-democratic or Conservative. Its support is given all the more readily to the Conservative party on account of the conflict which the Church wages with Dissent. The latter appeals in England more especially to the masses, among whom it finds the majority of its adherents. It has no interests inclining it in favour of rank or wealth, and, as might be expected, Liberal opinions are entertained by the majority of Dissenters. Thus the conflict between the Church and the Dissenters, extending from ecclesiastical to political and social affairs, tends to confirm the clergymen of the Church of England in their Conservative leanings.

The Scottish Church, on the other hand, contrasts broadly with the Church of England in its form, and the classes from which its clergymen are drawn. The freedom and cheapness of University education, and the comparatively easy passage from the University to the Church, secure a full representation of all classes of the people among the clergy. The minister may be, and very often is, the son of a small farmer, tradesman, or artisan. Nay, it is one of the ambitions common among the rural population to have a son in the pulpit. To attain this, the head of the family frequently spends his savings, and sacrifices the future of his other children. No inconsiderable number of those who have attained by their talents prominent and powerful positions in the Scottish Church, have sprung from the humbler ranks of society. Their sympathies are not those of the aristocrat, but of the man who has risen by constant and strenuous exertion above the rank of his birth. Nor can he forget the struggles of those by whose aid he succeeded. Their interests are his own. By closer and more intimate contact with the masses his opinions are more nearly allied to theirs. He sympathizes with their struggles and difficulties, and resents any injustice they may suffer. The system of patronage existed in Scotland until the year 1874, when it was abolished by Disraeli's government. It resulted undoubtedly in the frequent display of favouritism as between candidates. But through the influence of the Church courts it never took the same form of decided nepotism, nor, indeed, went to the same extreme as in England.

The contrast is not confined to the clergy, but extends to Church government. The Church of England has all the settled forms of a kingdom within the nation; the Scottish Church is essentially a republic. The form of Church government is Presbyterian. To begin with the lowest form of organization in the Church, the parish is superintended by a clergyman, aided by a body of laymen chosen out of the congregation, called the elders, and forming together the Kirk Session. The elders perform some of the duties which in

England are performed by the clergyman. The next higher court, the presbytery, consists of all the ministers of the parishes within its bounds, and one elder chosen by each Kirk Session; it has considerable power in the way of superintendence over individual congregations and their clergymen, and in admitting candidates to the clerical office. Then there are district assemblies called synods, made up of the members, lay and clerical, of the different presbyteries within the province. The synods meet so many times a year to consider the affairs of the province, and to hear appeals from the presbyteries. Last, and highest of all, there is the grand council of the whole Church, composed of delegates, both lay and clerical, in certain proportions from the presbyteries and certain public bodies. This body, called the General Assembly, is the supreme governing power of the Church, acknowledging no temporal head. Her Majesty's Commissioner is usually present at the meetings of Assembly, but he takes no part in the discussions, and, according to the standards of the Church, his presence is not a necessity. Now it is to be noted that the lay element is freely included, and possesses much influence and power in all the assemblies in which the most important questions, doctrinal and administrative, are settled. The representative elder sits in the General Assembly, and delivers his opinion and gives his vote as well as his minister, upon the most solemn occasions. He sits in judgment in cases of heresy, and his decision may lead to, or prevent, sentence of deposition. He may be a person of comparatively humble rank, and yet he is admitted into the most important offices. The effect of such an institution on the mind of the people, who are closely attached to it, can scarcely be other than democratic. The equality of the clergyman and layman in the right to sit in the highest courts, the freedom of discussion, and the total absence of aristocratic or class leanings or distinctions in the Church, make it a powerful instrument in favour of Liberal thought. Let it be observed, however, that the Scottish Church, as a Church, generally abstains from any active interference in politics. What we are speaking of just now is not the meddling with political and electioneering tactics, which is often seen on the other side of the border, but rather of the silent and powerful impulse towards democracy, which a great and popular institution, formed on the basis of absolute equality, must give, especially in a country where ecclesiastical questions and discussions have always excited the deepest interest. The absence of aristocratic supremacy and aristocratic forms from the constitution of the body in which the people are most deeply interested, gradually instils in other departments of the national life those popular ideas and sentiments which are at the root of Liberalism. The Church first roused popular feeling at the time of the Reformation, when it appealed from the nobles to the people for support. It has by its democratic forms continued to maintain the democratic sentiment

ever since. The feeling of the Church towards Dissenters displays none of the bitterness which is displayed in England. The Church of Scotland and the larger dissenting bodies live in terms of the closest friendship. The clergymen of these Churches exchange pulpits and perform for each other many friendly offices. The form of government of the principal dissenting bodies in Scotland is substantially the same as that of the Established Church, and possesses the same democratic characteristics. The controversies between the Churches have none of the feeling of caste. A minister of a dissenting church, should his character and talents justify it, is as much respected by the community at large as though he belonged to the Established Church. One of the reasons, therefore, for the active interest in the different political parties taken by the Church and the Dissenters in England does not exist in Scotland. The Church of Scotland is not identified with either party, and does not exert its influence against the popular feeling. But the freedom and equality displayed in its organization have been powerful means of educating the Scottish people in democratic ideas.

3. The influence of the landed aristocracy.—The third influence in political life to which the long survival of Conservative opinions may be traced is that of the landed proprietors. They compose the class whose privileges are attacked by the more popular of recent Radical movements. The patrician right to enjoy and command, and the people's duty to suffer and obey, are not being recognized with the same unquestioning assent as formerly. As a class, although there are many exceptions, the landed proprietors are ranked against the tendency to change which Liberalism seeks to guide and develop. Their interests demand that their opinions should be strongly anti-democratic and Conservative. In England the landed proprietor has retained a place and influence which is not possessed by his compeer in Scotland. From the earliest times to the present the English people have looked up to the aristocracy for guidance in national difficulties, and not always in vain. The nobles have gained therefore in times past a position as advisers and rulers, which the people have acquiesced in. This position is rendered more secure by the frequent residence of the English landlord at his country seat, which is comparatively near the capital. Either by himself or by members of his family the hall is brought frequently into contact with the cottage. The peasant sees and knows in his landlord one who is not only by birth, education, wealth, and social position his superior, but one who ordinarily uses these advantages for the benefit of his dependents. Such a personage has enormous power for promoting a political cause if he cares to exercise it. Moreover, his frequent residence at his country seat enables him to take a leading share in the management of county affairs, in the administration of justice, and in the social county gatherings. The county balls and dinners and

other functions, more or less official, and the meets during the fox-hunting season, make him known more or less intimately by a circle of his less distinguished neighbours. He presides at quarter sessions, or as Lord Lieutenant, High Sheriff, or Justice of the Peace he takes a part in magisterial business. Hence he is kept constantly in touch with the community at large, whose opinions are greatly moulded by his. The wealth and high social position of the English landed proprietor, combined with his constant or at least frequent association with the masses of the people, give him an influence over their opinions which he is not slow to exercise in the direction of his own Conservative views.

In Scotland, however, the position of the landed aristocracy is different. The nobles long ago lost touch with the mass of the Scottish people, and have never regained it. To trace the occasion of this we must go back to the time of the Reformation, and the political commotions which resulted in the establishment of Presbyterianism. After the nobility in Queen Mary's reign had, by the help of the people, overthrown the combined power of the throne and the Romish Church, and had established the Protestant faith as the dominant religion, the leaders hoped that their own power would be consolidated by the weakening of that of the Crown, and that they would be enriched by the spoils of the Church. But the clergy of the Reformed Church were not at all willing to forego their claim to the Church's patrimony, and to see it secularized and transferred to private individuals. They claimed to be maintained by the teinds and Church revenues which the nobles had seized. The nobles refused to entertain their claim, and offered to the clergy a very inadequate support out of the spoils. The consequence of the quarrel was to withdraw the nobles from supporting the Reformers, and to leave the latter to fight the battle of the Church. The ministers appealed to the people for support, and in return adopted the popular cause by maintaining the political rights of the commonalty. This position induced them to change the form of Church government from the aristocratic hierarchy of bishops to the democratic equality of Presbyterianism. The people took up the cause of the Church and the Presbyterian form of government with extraordinary enthusiasm. The history of Scotland for more than a century consists of an account of the struggle which ensued. The conflict, which lay between the Presbyterian Kirk and the mass of the people on the one hand, and the king, nobles, and bishops on the other, ended in the triumph of the former. The result was that the nobility, discredited by the defeat, lost the guidance of the popular mind and ceased to be the trusted leaders of the people. The Kirk and its ministers took their place for nearly a century and a half, and ruled the people with almost despotic power. The popular respect for the ministers and ecclesiastical bodies almost amounted to a superstition, and clearly interfered with the

growth of feelings of attachment towards the nobility. This estrangement was accentuated by the circumstances which attended the Union of the two Parliaments in the reign of Queen Anne, and by the consequences of the transference of the seat of government to London. The Union of the two Legislatures was not at first a popular measure in Scotland. Its opponents took advantage of some payments made to the nobles in respect of old debts due by the ancient Scottish Government, and compensation for the Darien disaster, to declare that the country had been sold. The feeling was very strong, and made some of the nobles who supported the Union very unpopular. But a stronger effect was produced by the separation of the nobles from their country by their absence in England. The necessity of attending the old Scots Parliament compelled many of the nobles to have residences in Edinburgh, where they were comparatively near their country seats. But as soon as the Union took place all this was changed. Every one who hoped to take part in the government of the country, and to enjoy the fruits of his labours, followed the Legislature in its migration. There was little chance of any one getting office unless he and his friends were in London to press his suit. There was thus a continual drain of the aristocratic element to London. So marked did this become that English writers and politicians frequently commented on the influx of Scotchmen into the capital, and their constant intrigues for place. Edinburgh was completely deserted by the nobles, and few, if any of them, have residences there now. Their absence from their native land naturally weakened their influence among their own people. They were no longer kept in touch with their neighbours, their hold on public opinion was loosened, and they gradually ceased to take the same share in public affairs in their own districts. There is therefore a great contrast between the English and Scotch county magnate. The influence of the one has been constant from the earliest times, whereas the other lost his power when his class ran counter to the predominant feeling of the country. The one is an ever-present participant in local business and affairs, whereas the other for more than a century and a half has been removed from the society of, and contact with, his neighbours by frequent and prolonged absences in a distant capital. In recent times the attractions offered by a rich and luxurious capital have to some degree perpetuated the custom. So that, unless for the purposes of sport or on casual visits, the large landowner is not often seen in his native land. The third great influence on the side of Conservatism in England, while not entirely absent, is reduced to comparatively small proportions in Scotland.

Accepting, therefore, the democratic tendency of the early Scottish thought and the doctrinaire character of the Scottish intellect, we find that the existing national institutions tend naturally towards the popular and Liberal platform. The genius of the Church and the

University is democratic, and it is not opposed by the influence of a powerful aristocracy popular with the people. In England, on the other hand, the genius of the Church and the University is aristocratic and exclusive, and they are combined with a powerful aristocracy and landed interest in a strong phalanx against democratic thought. The University receives within her walls a body of students almost entirely of the wealthy class, and many of her best and noblest teachers come from the Church. The Church welcomes to high preferment those who have distinguished themselves in the University as scholars, and relies on it for support. The landed gentleman has been educated in, and hopes to send his son to, the one institution, while he is connected with the other by membership and by his right of patronage. The relations of the whole three institutions are close and of the most cordial nature. An attack on one is resented as a threatened injury to the other two, which must be repelled by all their powers. There is an alliance strong and constant against any attack by their common foe, the democracy.

The Scotch Church holds up before the people by its constitution an example of democratic government, of which the keystone is the equality of its members. Its sympathies are with the mass of the people, from which its members and clergy are drawn. It does not depend for its support on any particular class. It is closely connected with the Universities, which open their gates to every rank of the community, and these two great forces are not opposed by any that could weaken their influence.

It is, therefore, not only on account of its past history, or the intellectual character of the people, but by the constant action of existent influences, that Scotland is Liberal. So far as it is possible to forecast the future, it may be predicted that these influences will continue to operate, and will result in the steady development and advance in Scotland of Liberal thought and Liberal principles.

EXPERIENCES IN THE SOUDAN AND ABYSSINIA.¹

MR. WYLDE is a merchant, who, after having spent some years in that capacity in Ceylon and on the Malabar coast, had been occupied in trading operations at Suakim for a considerable period before the events of 1883 and subsequent years of disorder and war in the Eastern Soudan. Of these stirring times he kept a record, and here describes them.

During his residence on the Red Sea littoral, Mr. Wylde had acquired command of colloquial Arabic and an intimate knowledge of the people's ways. His intimate relations with the caravan merchants also gave him full insight into the customs and opinions of most or all the tribes of the Eastern Soudan, he being frequently in communication with Berber and Khartoum. He also knew Massowah and its Egyptian officials; also their relations, more or less disreputable, with the Abyssinians. As to the latter, he had come in contact with Ras Aloula and other of their leaders; so that he was able to be of very great assistance in aiding Sir William Hewett, whom he accompanied to Adowa in February 1884, when our Treaty with King John was made—which, as Mr. Wylde asserts, later on, the British Government has done nothing to fulfil.² Besides these qualifications for dealing with the history of the period, Mr. Wylde is an enthusiastic sportsman; so that the lively little narratives he gives under this head render its pages attractive to many who desire to shun the confused politics of Egyptians, Abyssinians, Mahdists, and our Foreign Office—which Mr. Wylde does his best to unravel. Military readers will find much to interest them in the details that the author gives of several of the sanguinary conflicts of which Suakim was the base. Perhaps the most valuable portions of the work are those that describe the notable men with whom he was brought into close personal contact, from General Gordon in 1877—when, as an Egyptian Pasha, he went up to treat with King John—to Admiral Hewett, Stewart, Cameron (the Special), Burnaby, Sir Charles Warren, Generals Graham and Freemantle, several of the

¹ '83 to '87 in the Soudan; with an Account of Sir William Hewett's Mission to King John of Abyssinia. Two vols. With map. By A. B. Wylde. Remington & Co.

² See article, "Italy and Abyssinia," in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for March 1888.

naval officers, and others who took prominent parts in the struggles of the eventful four years covered by this history.

The narrative dates from November 1883, when Mahdism was first recognized as a menacing portent, as proved by the destruction at Melbeis of the Egyptian force under Hicks Pasha and Aliedeen Pasha. This event caused an uneasy feeling at Suakim, which shortly after was sharply stimulated by the overthrow of three-fourths of the garrison of that place that had proceeded by way of Trinkitat to relieve Tokar, but were utterly routed at El Teb by the Dervishes, and by the subsequent destruction of two companies that had started to relieve Singat. The writer, speaking of these affairs, says:—

“What a change! A year ago not an Eastern Soudani would stand up against a rifle; he did not understand it. He saw it only in the hands of Europeans, mostly Englishmen, who came to the Soudan for sport. In fact, the Soudanese stood in awe of the rifle and its little bit of lead that could kill everything, from the largest of wild beasts to the smallest of the gazelles. . . . There is evidently now no more chance of a handful of Egyptians being able to bully a whole tribe of Soudanese, and the outlook is far from a bright one.”

Our author then describes the panic which, with many ludicrous circumstances, just then possessed the people of Suakim, and the clumsy efforts made to fortify its outlying suburb of Gef, a panic which was only allayed by H.M.S. *Ranger* taking up a position that commanded the approaches. This reassured the people for the time; but he thus explains “the inexplicable change” that had come over these trembling Egyptian subjects: “I could see, and the natives also mentioned it, that Gordon, by his good government and help, had educated the Soudanese up to having a feeling of their own, and how the oppression of the Egyptians had worked on the people it was hard to say.”

As several of the leading “rebels,” Osman Digna included, had property in the town, many of its inhabitants, thinking to side with the rising power, went off to Osman’s camp. Mr. Wylde, at this stage of his record, makes some tentative effort to account for the uprising. This was just after Baker Pasha was appointed Governor-General of the Eastern Soudan, with whom Mr. Wylde, who had been sent by him to Massowah, was very intimate. The author puts it thus: “The tribes wanted to have legitimate commerce developed. Many of the slave-dealers, since Gessi’s expedition and the detention of Zebehr Pasha, had given up slaving, and, though they had not wholly succeeded, were getting another living; and, not being helped since Gordon Pasha’s departure, they had hailed Mahdism with delight, as a means of perhaps upsetting the Egyptian authority, which they detested, and getting back the easier and most remunerative mode of living. The reaction on the tribes, who were doing a large trade with the Europeans, and expected a railway to be built to develop

their trade, as it had got so congested, would also be against Egyptian rule, and not against Europeans, who had nothing to do with taxing them."

He says that Baker Pasha had a good idea of what the Soudan wanted, and was just the man to win the tribes back from Mahdism, but the material under him was as bad as it could be, and he had not time left to get it into order. Mr. Wylde gives a graphic description (p. 85) of the effects of the sudden announcement of the abandonment of the Soudan by the Egyptians, of which he was first told by Mason Bey—the energetic American naval lieutenant, of whom he gives many interesting particulars. Bad as the Egyptian rule had been, the people, for whom Suakim was the centre of civilization, were, because of its absolute cessation, without anything being set up instead, thrown into a state of utter consternation: "All that had been before was at an end; no more taxes, no more soldiers, no more Pashas, no more security, but absolute freedom to do what you pleased. No revolution, no change of dynasty or government, was ever so sudden. . . . It meant ruin to those who were left up country; it meant ruin to all those who had interests in the Soudan; it meant anarchy, murder, and the cessation of all law and order. . . . The instant destruction of years of work (mainly that of the few Europeans in service of the Khedive) that had partly civilized the inhabitants." And yet, as he says when at Massowah: "I never witnessed such cruelty as the Egyptians practise: no wonder the fellahcen do not like being taken for soldiers. Some of the men on board the mail-boat had seen forty years' service, and were treated worse than dogs." Their rations had been appropriated by their thieving commanders. And in the regular policy, if such it can be called, pursued towards the cultivators, the same hopeless effect is produced. After speaking of the fertility that springs up round wells and water-courses, the author remarks: "A great drawback is that the Egyptian official taxes all cultivation, and once a man pays taxes he always has to do so, as no excuse of drought is taken. If the country ever falls into the hands of a Government that will give the inhabitants a small premium for every well they open and every acre they cultivate, it will soon change its aspect." Sufficient revenue might, he considers, be obtained by lightly taxing the produce when it enters the town and comes to the coast for export.

As Mr. Wylde's history follows the course of his journals, it is so mixed up with personal narratives, anecdotes, all more or less racy, and sporting episodes, that it becomes exceedingly difficult to trace from it the regular sequence of public events; but we must try to do that to some extent. As he came up the coast from Massowah the vessel stopped off Trinkitat, and soon, by the intimation of stray bullet-shots from the shore, they were made aware that something had gone

wrong. This proved to be what he speaks of as "the awful catastrophe" of Baker Pasha's defeat and utter rout of his cowardly Egyptian force by the Dervishes at El-Teb. Mr. Wylde was much shocked at the loss of many of his friends, native as well as European, amongst the latter being Morice Bey, Dr. Leslie, Forrester-Walker, and others, whom he had known for years. Here it may be well that we should bear in mind that all these disasters occurred after the destruction of the nascent National Government of Egypt, mainly in consequence of our bombardment of Alexandria and the deportation to Ceylon of Arabi and his native Egyptian lieutenants.

On arriving at Suakim, Mr. Wylde found Admiral Hewett in charge there as Governor-General, to whom he reported himself, and gave full details of the valuable and extensive information he had obtained regarding the Abyssinians, and the condition of things on the borders. He found his house still occupied as the English officers' mess, under the care of Mrs. Sartorius, to whose own lively account of this period readers may be suitably referred. An English expedition was then expected, though nothing was known as to its composition or plan of operations. Meantime, much confusion prevailed at Suakim, caused by the demoralized Egyptian soldiery and the dispirited townspeople. "The Mahdi was the rising star; he was the most powerful person in the Soudan;" and it was only to be expected that those who had much to lose, as well as others who had everything to gain, "should throw in their lot with the stronger party." The environs had to be patrolled, and supplies had to be secured from the interior. In these services Mr. Wylde, whose knowledge of the vernacular *patois* was specially useful, and who had brought with him trusty Abyssinian scouts, was engaged by Baker Pasha and Colonel Hallam Parr, who had come from Cairo as Commandant. He also constantly consulted the Admiral, with whom it was already agreed he should proceed on the King John mission as soon as the policy could be settled. For some days the rabble of troops were in open mutiny, and were with difficulty restrained from effecting a wholesale gaol delivery. The worst "were Zebehr's blacks, who had no discipline," and incited the mean-spirited Egyptians to extend and prolong the disorder, which, with various amusing interludes, was only finally suppressed by a wholesale flogging, administered under the auspices of Admiral Hewett's Marines, which ceremony Mr. Wylde describes with much zest. When the submarine telegraph got to work the public of Suakim then heard about Gordon's mission to Khartoum and Colonel Stewart's movements; but not even Brewster Bey—one of the best men in the Egyptian service—could understand what the policy was, though every one knew that Gordon wielded great personal influence over all the tribes. As to the Nile Expedition—though Mr. Wylde disapproved of that route—he remarks that, had it been started "in

December 1883 instead of in February 1884, there would not have been the ghastly butcher's bill and the onus of the lives of thousands of human creatures at some people's doors." It may seem strange that a short three months should make all that difference; but we must leave the "some people" concerned, at Whitehall and Cairo, to settle that amongst themselves.

About this time—though Mr. Wylde disdains details of dates—Singat was closely invested by the Dervishes, only some forty miles from Suakim; and one of the author's more graphic stories (pp. 126–129) is that of the heroic defence made there by Tewfik Bey, for whom Mr. Wylde had great respect, and who appears to have been by far the best of the native Egyptian leaders. He died fighting to the last; and the savage satisfaction of his enemies was manifested on his remains in a fashion which it would be unpleasant to specify. Mr. Wylde says: "I shall never forget the piercing shrieks of the women in Suakim when the news arrived of the massacre of the Singat garrison. The majority of the men that had fallen were townspeople, and belonged to the local Bashi-Bazouks"—who are half-breeds of Egyptian and Turkish origin, and mostly make courageous soldiers. Shortly afterwards Tokar capitulated, but in that case the garrison and people were spared. These massacres made Osman Digna, as representative of the Mahdi, master of the whole Eastern Soudan. The preparations to receive the British expedition were now going on apace; coolies from Jeddah were swarming in the place, and Mr. Wylde seems to have been a sort of general bazaar-master, having a rough time of it, at which "the stick was served out" regularly every day, with the approval of the Admiral, who was determined to secure order before the troops arrived. By the end of February the Indian Contingent was coming in, General Graham had arrived, and on March 1 the battle of El Teb had been fought, from Trinkitat as the base; and this victory put fresh spirits into all concerned. Mr. Wylde gives a striking account of the arrival of that news in the shape of a despatch from Mr. Burleigh for the *Daily Telegraph*, brought overland by an Arab boy, who had run all the weary forty-five miles across the desert during the night. This priority of news was a great success for the Special. Captain Hastings, R.N., as chief of the Intelligence Department, opened the despatch, but only sent on a brief account to the War Office, which, being in cipher, allowed the Press despatch, which he at once put on the telegraph wires, to get to the journal and the public first of all. Mr. Wylde remarks that in cases of this kind it is the right course for Press despatches to go through the Intelligence officers, instead of leaving them to the inevitable delay of the military Press censor, whose repressive action, we may remember, was often so bitterly resented during the Nile Expedition. He expresses admiration for the pluck shown by the Arabs in charging the British square,

and then records this grim reflection: "What a shamble the road from the mainland at Trinkitat to Tokar must be, and how many thousands of people have already met their deaths there—and for what reason? Summed up in two words—mal-administration and oppression."

Preparations were now almost completed for an advance in force on Tamai, the central position of the Dervish leader, about thirty miles south-west from Suakim. Here Mr. Wylde refers to the incident of the proclamation, drawn up, with the signature of Admiral Hewett, offering a reward for the capture of Osman Digna, "dead or alive." After a good growl at the newspaper correspondents, as "a great nuisance sometimes," but whose comments on this extra-military device secured its withdrawal, Mr. Wylde proceeds to excuse or justify it on somewhat better grounds than those advanced at the time. He seems to think that, because Osman Digna was primarily the emissary and "agent of the false prophet, Mahomed Achmed," and not revolting against Egyptian misrule, therefore he is to be regarded as a public enemy, not as one of the Soudanese "struggling, and rightly struggling, to be free." Besides, "he had committed acts entirely inexcusable, and against all the laws of either savage or civilized nations," having, amongst other atrocities, "killed in cold blood a messenger who, with a flag of truce, arrived (at his camp) with a letter from the Admiral." As our author puts it, and advised at the time, had the proclamation set out, as in an indictment, the crimes of which Osman was notoriously guilty, and had the sentence of death been also formally recorded in the document, it would then have had a legal quality that must have "met with universal approbation, would have won for us many friends among the natives, and would in all probability have secured Osman Digna alive." As it was, the natives themselves saw that our commanders did not understand the quality of the arch-scoundrel; while it was like a confession to the outside world that, being unable to deal with him in fair fight, they were driven to resort to an incitement to treachery and assassination. Had the former quasi-judicial course been taken, and Osman's capture secured, Mr. Wylde thinks the Dervish rising would have collapsed, as a new leader would have had to be sent from El Obeyd, and no other could have commanded half the influence that Osman wielded.

The older troops having been brought away from Tokar and Trinkitat, the new forces, including the 10th Hussars halted on their way back from India, Marines collected from the China and other naval stations, bluejackets from the now large fleets, mounted infantry from Egypt, and guns many, were now marshalled for the advance. Speaking of this Army Corps, when a few days later he met it, in order of march at Teselah, already in view of the enemy, Mr. Wylde remarks:—"It was a fine sight, and there could be no doubt that

they were as splendid a lot of men as could be found in the world." His service with this expedition was the highly important one of acting as a guide for the advanced and reconnoitring parties, of whom Colonel Ardagh, R.E., was in charge, as head of the Intelligence Department. He had brought with him from Massowah fifty Abyssinians, trained as scouts, in which capacity their services seem to have been essential. As he remarks, had there been five hundred of them, the close of the great engagement at Tamai would have been more satisfactory. Mr. Wylde's narrative of the very irregular march with his scouts through the bush to Baker's zareeba is full of very lively interest (pp. 133-147). That was from early on the 11th to the night of the 12th, of which night he says—"I shall never forget it as long as I live." The Arabs had begun a scattering attack, but which proved only to be desultory and without distinct plan. However, in the early morning Mr. Wylde was desired by General Graham to go forward with his scouts to see if he could stop the firing, or, we may suppose, bring on the attack, if such were really intended. Mr. Wylde replied, "Yes, sir," and cheerfully accepted this perilous service; but one can well understand him when he adds: "I would much rather you went out than me!" and an officer, one of his friends, chaffed him with the grim remark: "I will look after your things if you don't come back." However, after taking his scouts as near to the enemy's lines as they could get without being seen, he returned, about 8 P.M., to report to the General, who directed him, after resting his men, to join the mounted infantry. The force was then marshalled; and he then describes the pause before the battle—"the terrible loss of so many brave men"—which he thinks might have been lessened had more regard been had to an intimation actually sent in from Suakim by a spy of the Admiral's as to the exact place on the banks of Khor-Ghob nullah where the Arabs intended to make their attack. He writes: "There seemed to be dead stillness over everything, as when a tropical storm is going to break, or like the calm that often precedes a storm at sea; the only living things that seemed to be excited were the birds, especially the sand grouse and the desert plover. The former were flying about in large packs, prevented from getting their usual morning drink at the water at Tamai, owing to its being occupied, while their feeding-ground was taken up by the troops advancing." As full descriptions of the action as given by the Specials at the time, and subsequently revised by the military authorities, are familiar to most readers, we can readily accept Mr. Wylde's account of the only part of the turmoil in which he mingled. Just after he heard the Dervish battle-cry, "Sheik Abdul Kader," he lost his camel, had to scramble for his helmet, was carried away amidst the stampede of the transport animals until he found himself jammed against a company of Marines. After other exciting adventures he

was still in time to witness the principal attack of the Arabs against General Buller's compact array: "The Arabs, who were in irregular formation and three to ten deep, came along at a run, and it was just like a big black wave running up to a beach. It began to break on the crest, the white foam being represented by the men that fell simultaneously with every volley, and the wave began to grow less and less the more it neared the square. Within 250 yards it nearly ceased, and not one man could get near enough to use his spear. It was an awful sight, and as an exhibition of pluck, or rather fanaticism, it could not be equalled. Poor, deluded Arabs!—thinking they could do anything with their spears and swords out in the open against disciplined troops armed with rifles of precision." He speaks of the tenacity of the wounded, who strove to the last to crawl to some weapon "to have a chance of killing a Christian, in the hope of going straight to Paradise;" and he excuses the killing of these maimed wretches as in sheer self-defence. He says: "We halted for a full half-hour on the banks, and the whole ground was thick with corpses, those killed by the shell fire having most ghastly wounds. In some places the dead were literally in heaps, and in all sorts of positions: there were several standing against trees and bushes . . . it was only when we got within a few feet that the eye could be seen to have the film of death upon it." One more quotation, and we must leave this ghastly reverse side of the "glorious victory of Tainai:" "It was now about one o'clock, and all the fighting was over. No one who witnessed the horrors of a battle-field can ever wish to see another. Certainly I do not, or to see another man killed in anger . . . remains of human beings strewed about in their thousands, slaughtered, and for what purpose? Policy there was none. If I could have imagined any good to have been got out of killing these Arabs by a continuous action hereafter of help and trying to teach them the error of their ways, I should have been happy. I felt the reaction now all was over, and was most wretched."

Mr. Wyldé then speaks of the British slain, several of whom had been his friends, and whom he had to be called to recognize under the disguise of their disfigurements. After describing the acute grief felt at the funeral service, he thus closes the chapter on "The Horrors of War:" "The heavens, with their light fleecy clouds, were lighted up with that beautiful after-glow that follows the sunsets at Suakim, when the trenches were being covered up, shutting for ever from view the remains of our poor comrades, who had fought so well and done their duty in so poor a cause."

As soon as these and similar melancholy duties were performed, Mr. Wyldé entered vigorously on the preparations needed to conduct the Admiral's mission into Abyssinia. In the first three chapters of the second volume are narrated the account of that interesting

episode; and though our author indulges in many digressions—always either interesting or important—he compensates for some diffuseness in his diplomatic report, by reverting to Abyssinian affairs more specifically in the subsequent chapters. In course of his diary notes of the journey from Massowah up country he relieves his mind on the subject of missionary enterprise in Abyssinia and the border lands between, where, it must be confessed, that agency of modern civilization has been pursued from very mixed motives and with many unpleasant results to all concerned. Perhaps we shall at once do justice to this part of the subject and afford excuse for Mr. Wylde dwelling on it, by quoting one sentence: “I have had conversations with Ras Aloula and many other influential Abyssinians on what they require politically and religiously, and I never heard them express any other wish than to be left alone to mind their own affairs and not to have other peoples’ religions and teachings thrust down their throats.”

Admiral Hewett’s undertaking seems to have been rather hampered by the bad impressions left at the time of General Gordon’s (Egyptian) Mission, surrounded and prejudiced as his efforts had been by the French, Russian, Spanish, and Italian envoys of sorts, who were constantly “hovering round,” while the Greek Consul at Suez appears to have been always on the move between Massowah and Adowa, and was “always hovering about the King’s house.” However, when King John was properly informed of the Admiral’s approach, he brushed the intruders aside, and gave out that he would see no strangers until the British Mission arrived. Mr. Wylde describes the King’s arrival at Adowa, and says of the occasion, “as a show of barbaric splendour it could not be equalled—unlike anything I have seen in the East.” He speaks of King John as about five feet nine in stature, active and muscular, oval face, with tolerably regular features, except that the cheek-bones are rather high and the chin recedes somewhat. His garments were plain, though of better stuff than those around him—also “clean;” his only head ornament being a handsome gold pin stuck in his plaited hair. In receiving the Mission he was seated on a Bombay blackwood carved bedstead, with black cushions, trimmed with silver lace and tassels. Compared with this sober state of the Negus, some of his visitors must have seemed gorgeously apparelled; when the intruding Consuls were in full uniform they eclipsed the members of our Mission; “not the Admiral, in full uniform, with all his blaze of medals, or Mason Bey, in his brass-bound coat, could even come up to the Greek Consul;” but Captain Kennedy’s soldier-servant, a 42nd Highlander, attracted most attention—partly because of his red coat reminding the native spectators of Napier’s expedition in 1868. The King had most of his face covered when Admiral Hewett opened his business proposals, by presenting our Queen’s letter—“a most gorgeous docu-

ment," in an envelope of velvet and gold ; Mason Bey also presented a letter from the Khedive—which would have scant welcome ; and Captain Speedy presented one from Lord Napier of Magdala, the contents of which, we may be sure, would be eagerly conned. Then the presents were brought in, when, catching glimpses of rifles and other arms his Majesty dropped his improvised mask, and was soon in animated conversation (of course through an interpreter) with the Admiral, whose "appropriate and manly words" were in the right style of frank diplomacy. The interview closed, the next proceeding was to set up the grand tent brought as a present for the King ; the scribe set to work translating the letters, and presently the Treaty was put into shape. This rather tough business seems to have occupied a few days ; then came the grand ceremony of sealing, and the adorning of the Admiral with wonderful robes, shield, sword, and accoutrements embossed and gilded in grand style—not omitting two or three special personal ornaments, including, of course, "the Order of Solomon." As the principal garment was a cape trimmed with a lion's mane, beads and brooches galore, the gallant Admiral might have held his own even in the Court of the Grand Monarque. Even King John seemed impressed with the grand show that his much-clothed visitors made when taking leave of them, while expressing the hope that "his friendship for the English would always last." But the decorated travellers, when fairly on their way down hill to their own camp, began to see themselves as they would have appeared to their friends at home. Mr. Wylde says :—"What would Barnum or Sanger have given for the cavalcade : the Lord Mayor of the period," he thinks, "would have given any money to have for his procession a real live English Admiral dressed as the biggest full-grown Abyssinian official." The narrator is indeed ungracious enough to speak of his own superb satin and belaced garment as "a night-shirt," a world too short for his long legs, which, as he could not hitch his toe on to the mule's stirrup, displayed his dangling extremities to the derision of his companions.

In his chapter on "Abyssinian Prospects" there are many shrewd remarks, intermingled with what now read as too hopeful anticipations. He says : "I don't think, now that England has sent a mission to King John, that he will in future listen to any other foreign Power, and it very much depends on what policy is pursued, whether the country will not be opened at once to trade. . . . Peace is now a fact, and a brisk trade is being carried on already, with every chance of its increase, and a good understanding will take place between the two countries as long as a Christian Governor is left at Massowah." Briefly, it may be said that this fair prospect has been indefinitely postponed—first, because no English Consul was placed at Massowah to aid in giving effect to the Treaty ; and, second, because we allowed the essential point of that agreement to be super-

seded by the Italian invasion, an event which was really invited by the ineptitude of our own Foreign Office. Here, by anticipation, we may refer to the concluding chapter, which, though chiefly occupied with a searching exposition of the slave-trade question—an unmitigated disgrace to every one concerned—deals concisely in its two or three closing pages with the whole subject of the Soudan, of Abyssinia, and the Red Sea Coast. Before quitting the subject of Abyssinia we ought to quote the author's description of Ras Aloula, who, though he has fallen into disgrace since this was written, must, if he keeps his head on, come again to the front as the typical chief of King John's State:—

“Ras Aloula is a man about forty years of age, a little above the average height, say about five feet nine inches. He is very well built, has broad shoulders and a deep chest, which makes him look shorter than he really is. He is muscular and athletic, and can hold his own with any men of his army in feats of skill, such as riding and shooting. He is a great sportsman, when he has the time to devote to the chase, which latterly has not been very often. He wears his hair cut short as a rule, and lets it grow naturally, not plaiting it like the majority of his nation. His complexion is copper-coloured, not very dark; his face oval, his nose of good shape, his mouth small, set off by good teeth. His whole features are regular, and when he smiles, which he often does when talking in private and not before his followers, his face is most pleasing, and his manner winning. He can be very stern, and on business or political occasions almost as immovable as a statue.

“He has the reputation, and has no doubt earned it, of being a good general, a skilful tactician, and a rapid marcher. His has been a turbulent frontier to look after, and he has to fight against Egyptian intrigues, and in this he has been perfectly successful.”

On his return to Suakim, at the close of 1884, Mr. Wylde found confusion on the pier, railway, and other public works then proceeding, also utterly conflicting counsels as to the policy required for settling the Soudan. Hence his chapter, “Events before the 1885 Expedition,” bristles with telling and humorous points of criticism, and also gives the results of much direct and intimate knowledge of the region and people, which might still be turned to good account. One of his convictions Mr. Wylde makes quite clear—namely, that, alike for the purpose of pacifying the Soudan and rescuing Gordon, the Suakim-Berber route was the only practicable one, and the Nile route was utterly and wickedly wrong. So manifestly wrong, wasteful, and futile does he regard the choice of the river route, that he can only account for it on the hypothesis, for which there seems much occasion—that the decision of the British Cabinet—that is, the Foreign and War Office Secretaries of the day—had been influenced by the Egyptian bondholders and wily native speculators at Cairo. No doubt this theory leaves out the opinion of “our only General;” but he has had his say. Mr. Wylde puts his side of the argument thus:—“Commerce opened the Soudan; and modern commerce is a never-failing guide to general or politician to the

cheapest and best route to any interior. The water picnic *via* the Nile is one of the most splendid firework schemes that has ever been put before an admiring world." It was early in February that vague news filtered into Suakim about the fall of Khartoum; but we must refer readers to pages 80–86 for the author's reflections on the fate of Gordon, and his review of the desperate march across the Bayudah Desert, with the grievous losses at Abu Klea and Abu Kru—all the prominent men there sacrificed being well known and deeply mourned at Suakim—Stewart, Burnaby, Cameron, and the rest. The only consolation to set against the bitter grief of that period Mr. Wyld suggests, is, that had it not been for the superstition that deters the Arabs from making night attacks, every British soldier and ally south of Dongola would have been utterly swept away. As to the still debated question whether, if the steamers had started immediately from Gubat, the fall of Khartoum would have been prevented, Mr. Wyld replies: "This I do not believe. The whole expedition was at least a month too late, and the fate of Khartoum was sealed the moment Omdurman fell into the hands of the Mahdi." This is even admitting that the Nile route had anything to be said in its favour, which our author does not. From his point of view, for which he claims to have had General Stewart's support, an expedition across to Berber would have saved Gordon, smashed the Mahdi, and given the Soudan a chance for that pacification, for which, as shown by the attacks on Suakim going on whilst we write, it still waits.

Much is told in this chapter of the gathering of General Graham's multifarious forces, British of all arms, naval included, Australians, and the considerable contingent from India, while the harbour was thronged with shipping, nearly fifty sail, proving that Suakim as a port offers facilities for very large mercantile operations. Mr. Wyld gives graphic, though brief, descriptions of the engagement at Hasheem; and also of the former disastrous, though gallant struggle, in 1884, on the march towards Tamai. As to this deplorable surprise and fearful destruction amongst the transport and commissariat portion of the force, our author puts it down to the obstinate disregard by the Intelligence Department, or its superiors, of the true and timely information given by the spies and scouts. In a later chapter, and speaking of the time after Tamai was taken, he describes the ghastly scenes there and of the former fight of 1884, remarking, "I shall never forget the night I spent at Tamai, with its attendant miseries. Talk about abject pictures of despair, the terrors of the infernal regions, and other horrors: I could never have imagined a more terrible sight." And this slaughter and misery, as he considers, was useless. He says: "For the life of me I never could see what was the use of the Suakim expedition in 1885, unless it was to spend money and make a military demonstration."

We must not omit to mention, as of possibly prospective interest, Mr. Wylde's Chapter v. Vol. II., which is entirely devoted to the project of a Suakim to Berber railway—metre-gauge and steel rails. This, it seems, he proposed to the Egyptian Government eight years ago, long before the trouble began; and now that it is all over—including the fearful muddle and waste over the twenty miles of abortive military railway—he considers that this bold public works project is still well worth being carried out. There is this to be said for it, from an engineering and commercial point of view, that the railway to Berber would form a base from which, by supplying steamers with fuel, all the vast and fertile provinces of the far Upper Nile would be brought into contact with the commerce of the modern world. As our author says, "There is a future for the Soudan and a railway, as long as the Turk and the Egyptian are kept away from the country." Apart from the valuable general information which abounds in this chapter, its backbone consists of a copy of the report on the whole question of railways for the Soudan, made by a Commission appointed by the Khedive; it is dated June 1883. If this report be read along with the paper by Mr. Wylde placed before the British Association at Manchester in 1887, on the "Red Sea Trade," which is reproduced as an appendix, there needs scarcely anything more—except due reference to the excellent map with Vol. I.—to enable either engineers or commercial exploiters to form full and satisfactory conclusions regarding some such modern method of regenerating the Soudan and emancipating a very large portion of north-eastern Africa from the curse of slavery, fanaticism, and tribal war. There is also another appendix, "Eastern Soudan: Geographical Notes," which comprises detailed route statistics; so that this work, apart from its deep interest as contemporary history, and as a retrospect of stirring events, must be of much permanent value for reference. It affords material from which those who foresee a productive and happy future for those now distracted regions can draw stores of special and suggestive information.

HOME AFFAIRS.

A DELUGE of political speeches has followed upon the holidays, with promise not to abate until Christmas. To go through endless columns of the newspapers has been weary work enough, but it has not been futile. The careful reader must have made more than one discovery in recent days. We are entering upon another phase of the great controversy of the time. The Unionists of both fractions are about to execute a fresh strategic movement. Their burning zeal for legislation has suddenly cooled. One effort has been enough for them. Having passed an emasculated scheme of Local Government for England and Wales, they ask us "to rest and be thankful." Or, to put the matter in another way, they shy at the next question. Brought face to face with one of two things, they have examined both, and like neither. The difficulties of Land Purchase and of Irish Local Government are equally formidable, and the advice of the wire-pullers who suggest postponement is to be taken. Lord Hartington makes the announcement to the country with characteristic stolidity. He began his story at Inverness, and finished it at Belfast. The division of the subject suggests a natural hesitation which does the noble Marquis credit. It needed a certain hardihood, no doubt, to inform the country that the Unionists were again about to "climb down," and prudence dictated that it had better be done "at twice." It might not look so bad. Besides, consideration for the feelings of other people demanded this circumspection. If Mr. Chamberlain must be put aside, it must not be done roughly. The right honourable gentleman has his angles even to those he best loves. So the noble Marquis handled him gently. The suppression of the latest Birmingham plan for the settlement of Ireland was neatly done, and one can fancy Lord Salisbury congratulating the great Whig leader upon his astuteness. It is a great *coup*, at any rate, for the Government.

To speak plainly, there is now little doubt that next year is to be barren of any serious legislation for Ireland. The Unionists mean to mark time. Everything tells them that this is their best policy. Certainly it is their only safe policy. Lord Hartington's clear vision has never taken him far wrong. He blunders only for a moment, and at long intervals. Having taken up a defensive position, he sees the risk of any advance, and if he ventures under pressure, now

and then, to go out of his works, he is not long in getting back to his trenches. And now he has determined that he will not again be drawn. At Inverness he told us that Parliament might soon be engaged with a measure of Local Government for Scotland, and that the prospects of an extension of local liberties in Ireland were not very bright. This was the first half of his announcement. He has since spoken twice in Belfast. In his first address he laid it down that the demand for Local Government for Ireland, made in 1885 by the Liberals of Ulster, must be reconsidered in view of a powerful attack upon the Union, since Local Government under guarantee of the Union, and Local Government shorn of this guarantee, would be two very different things. Reconsideration is explained by Lord Hartington himself to mean the absolute withdrawal of the demand made until the conditions of 1885—about which much might be said—return to Ireland. To the Ulster Hall meeting the Unionist leader made another proposal. Dealing with the question of Land Purchase, he used this significant language :—“The people of Great Britain and Ireland did not show themselves very favourable to Mr. Gladstone’s great scheme of settlement, and, to speak frankly to you, I will say that I do not think that the people of Great Britain will look favourably upon any great scheme of Irish land settlement, whether it is Mr. Gladstone’s or whether it be proposed by others, which involves a great expenditure of English capital, or English credit, until the British nation is assured, better than it is now, that law and order will be maintained in Ireland; that contracts will be observed; and that engagements entered into between individuals, as between nations, will be faithfully kept.” Having thus laid it down that we are not ripe for a complete settlement of the land question, Lord Hartington proposes to proceed to the extension of Lord Ashbourne’s Act. Local Government, and the creation *en masse* of a peasant proprietary are declared impossible. They are not to be thought of in the present state of Ireland. But Lord Hartington would give more millions to keep going a system of purchase which is in the highest degree unsafe, and many other millions to develop the material resources of the island, by schemes of arterial drainage, the extension of the railway system, the construction of harbours, and the like. To crown it all, he coolly asks the Home Rulers to help in this, as doing no prejudice to their cause. They are to have anything but the great things they want, and to encourage the Government to cut the ground beneath their feet by all manner of experiments. Meantime evictions may go on for arrears condemned as unjust by the reduction of rents, and Mr. Balfour is to see to it that “order is maintained in Warsaw.”

Such is the policy now offered in regard to Ireland. Nobody needs to be told that this, being the policy of Lord Hartington,

is also that of the Government. There can hardly be a doubt that it has been planned in concert with Lord Salisbury. It fulfils all the needs of the Government. They know very well that they dare not undertake the enterprises which Lord Hartington postpones. These are too full of risks. Time may solve the difficulties which are found in them, and, if it does not, time will ultimately extinguish Mr. Gladstone. Postponement has consequently a double virtue. It wears such attractive guise that we need have no hesitation in accepting the recent statement of a leading Unionist, that the Session of next year is to be "one of rest," beginning late and rising soon. But upon this assumption, one or two questions press themselves upon our notice. What becomes of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Courtney? The Member for West Birmingham in his last scheme for the settlement of Ireland insists upon the urgency of the agrarian question. A final solution of this, and the rest is easy. Whereas Lord R. Churchill would take up Local Government first, Mr. Chamberlain is eager to create a vast peasant proprietary, by compelling the Irish landlords to take the bonds of a Land Bank bolstered up exclusively by Irish security. If we are to believe all we hear, Mr. Chamberlain had set his heart upon the prompt realization of this scheme, which was to give him a position of pre-eminence over Mr. Gladstone, whose disastrous failure in 1886 would thus be exhibited in its most ignoble light. Mr. Chamberlain's revenge is now delayed—whether it will come at all is doubtful. Happily he has pledged himself to be generous. At Nottingham he said loftily that, if his scheme were not adopted, he should not, like the Greek, retire into his tent and sulk. The native astuteness of the right hon. gentleman led him to throw up the sponge in advance, which gives Mr. John Morley ground for saying that all his plans were nothing more than "pricks of conscience." Poor Mr. Courtney is, however, in different case. A few hours before Lord Hartington appeared at Belfast, the Chairman of Committees told his Cornish constituents that he was in favour of the unrestricted extension to Ireland of Mr. Ritchie's Local Government Bill. The statement seems to have taken a portion of his auditory aback, and "a Voice" promptly put the query, "But will Lord Hartington back you?" Confident of his leader, Mr. Courtney replied, "Yes, I think he will!" Alas for the vanity of human hopes! The next night there came the first announcement at Belfast telling Mr. Courtney that he had unwittingly palmed off upon the Cornishmen what Sir Stafford Northcote would have called "a thumper." It would be interesting to know how Lord Hartington's friends generally, and especially those who delight in calling themselves Radical Unionists, feel about this "new departure." For most of them the policy proposed is a deliberate negation of their pledges. Few among them have been as cautious, or seen as far ahead, as their chief. They have believed it was possible to do something else than

stand still, and suddenly they find themselves rudely pulled up by one whom they cannot ignore. It should soon begin to be borne in upon the minds of these gentlemen that there are but two alternatives in regard to Ireland—the policy of repression and of marking time, and the policy which has been identified with the name of Mr. Gladstone. And when the period of incubation has been accomplished, we ought to have some results not displeasing to those who have espoused the cause of the Irish people.

Meantime, the question is asked, with a good deal of force, whether Home Rulers are to sit down and quietly watch the development of the new situation. The answer from the ranks is yet to be given. We believe it will be a vigorous "No." A protest should be made against the policy of postponement, and made with effect. There has been some talk of "forcing a dissolution." Mr. William O'Brien thinks that this can be done in the Spring, and Mr. Stansfeld seems to think that it ought to be attempted. For ourselves, we have but one reservation—that we don't quite see how it is to be done. It is useless in these days to threaten to "stop supplies." The experiment, if made, would probably not succeed. Mr. Smith would come down with one of his wholesale *clôture* motions, and the majority of the House would accept it. The New Rules seem to have given this power to the Unionists, and, unless there are other means more promising than obstructing the discussion of the Estimates, Sir Edward Clarke is justified in denouncing the scheme of forcing a dissolution as "fantastic and futile." At the same time, we are not without hope that an expedient may be found for bringing the whole issue before the electors at a comparatively early date. Meanwhile, it is a clear duty to make protest, both inside and outside Parliament, against the tactics of the Unionist leaders. The right claimed for the Ulster Liberals to reconsider the position taken up on Local Government in 1885 is abrogated by the fact that they have demanded the reform every year since in full knowledge of the aims and direction of Nationalist policy. And at Glasgow, only the other day, the Liberal Unionists of West Scotland, in an address to Mr. Balfour, expressed the hope that he "would not relinquish his great task until he had carried as large a measure of reform for the government of Ireland as was consistent with the safety and union of the Empire:" upon which the Chief Secretary, with a caution which becomes significant to-day, observed that he wished to see some measure of agrarian reform carried which would altogether remove from among the ranks of their opponents that class of tenant farmers in Ireland who were seduced, not by the cry of Home Rule, but by less honourable motives, the outcome of suggestions made by designing agitators. This, of course, is sufficiently vague to mean anything, including the extension of Lord Ashbourne's Act, now the sole specific of Lord

Hartington. Clearly it does not touch the question of Local Government. The Glasgow Unionists, however, only ask what others of their faction have demanded. If Lord Hartington does not know it, the public are less forgetful. And it may very pertinently be asked how his Parliamentary followers can, with any face, now take up the policy of delay?

It will, we think, be understood from the foregoing that Lord Hartington has, during the month, made nearer approach to the Government, so much so that at Leeds Lord Rosebery took farewell of him "for ever and for aye." Again the gossips speak of coalition. The time is, however, probably not yet. Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington are about to dine together at the table of the Ulster Liberals; but Lord Hartington believes he can still deal the most effective blows to his old friends by sitting with them in the House of Commons, and Mr. Balfour has become so alive to the virtues of Government by Party, that at Haddington he advised his Unionist friends to continue their separate organizations. He looks ahead to the time when the Irish question will be solved on his own lines, and when parties will return to their old allegiances. The one man who seems to hanker after coalition is, strangely enough, Mr. Chamberlain. At Nottingham he told us that Tories and Liberal Unionists had gone through the fire together, and had come out—he did not say purified, but with an increased mutual respect and liking. And he spoke with something like enthusiasm of the resolution taken by the Radical Unionists, both at Bradford and at Nottingham, to start a close working arrangement with the Tory electoral organizations throughout the country. It was no use the Gladstonians laying traps to draw off the Unionists from the Tories—the thing could not be done. He would not raise a finger to turn out the present Government. And so the erstwhile Radical not only throws over the programme he has elaborated with such ostentatious care, but practically throws himself into the arms of the Tories. That they do not forthwith offer him a place is possibly due, less to the right hon. gentleman's unwillingness to take it, than to their own desire to keep the good things to themselves. At the same time it ought not to surprise us if we witness a startling metamorphosis in Mr. Chamberlain. His particular organ in the Birmingham press hints, not obscurely, that "persecution" may drive him to desperate things. It is thus that we stand upon principle!

It will be interesting to follow the development of these new tactics, and especially to observe the conduct of the Liberal Unionists. Mr. Courtney is not only willing to give the Irish Mr. Ritchie's scheme of Local Government, but he has a plan for reforming Dublin Castle. It consists mainly in this: that the different administrative bureaux, which are now left almost entirely to the direction of the permanent officials in Ireland, should be represented each by a political under-

secretary, responsible to Parliament, and sitting at Westminster with Mr. Balfour. He would also establish some sort of connection between these departments and the corresponding British departments in London, so as to give an English spirit to Irish administration. It seems that this scheme has struck the imagination of Sir M. Hicks-Beach, a former Chief Secretary for Ireland, and he has spoken most favourably of it at Plymouth. On the other hand, all Sir Michael will say about the extension of Local Government in Ireland is that it should not be indefinitely delayed—a cautious phrase enough—and that, when it takes place, it should be, not upon the lines of Mr. Ritchie's recent Bill, but of a distinctly restricted character. These proposals have, however, very small interest in the circumstances—much less than Mr. Courtney's statement that he is prepared to support the Gladstonians in demanding an official inquiry into the Mitchelstown massacre of last year, or than the question raised by Mr. Davitt as to the authority which is to settle permanently the Irish agrarian question. Mr. Davitt tells us very frankly that Mr. Parnell severely reproached him for his hasty attack upon the Gladstonians in regard to their assumed apathy concerning evictions. According to the Irish leader, the Gladstonian party were largely absolved from the necessity of taking action upon this question of evictions, for the reason that they had agreed to hand over the land question to the Irish Parliament. Now it must be said that this is news to us. So far, at any rate, there has been no distinct statement on the subject either by Mr. Gladstone or any of his lieutenants. Mr. Davitt pleads hard and ably for an Irish settlement. Any scheme arranged by the Westminster Parliament must, he holds, be unnecessarily extravagant, and there would consequently be a great temptation to repudiation. *Per contra*, it may be said that any purely Irish arrangement would possibly be severely hard upon the land-owning class. Much as we sympathize with the Nationalist view that the Irish landlords have had their due from the soil of Ireland, it is necessary, if only for the sake of the better men among them, that they should be treated with justice in the final settlement of affairs, and, without some sort of guarantee to this effect, difficulty must arise in handing over to an Irish Parliament the treatment of the agrarian question. Lord Hartington is for holding Mr. Gladstone, Lord Spencer, and Mr. Morley to their declaration that Home Rule and the land must be dealt with together; but, on Lord Hartington's own principle, the Home Rule leaders have a right to "reconsider" in the light of later circumstances. And it may be noted that Mr. Davitt, spite of his belief that the landlords are not entitled to a farthing of compensation, is nevertheless willing to give them what a representative commission of people and landlords would agree upon as a just price.

Lord Hartington denies that his tactics are the tactics of despair. But he is nothing like as jubilant concerning the "progress" made

in Ireland in the restoration of the reign of law as the Chief Secretary and the Lord Lieutenant. If we may accept the figures quoted at Belfast by Lord Londonderry, things are going swimmingly. The Crimes Act has diminished agrarian outrages by 28 per cent., partial boycottings by 72 per cent., and complete boycottings by 90 per cent., whilst—and this is the remarkable thing—160 farms, from which tenants have been evicted, have been re-let in the first six months of this year. His Excellency declined to give particulars on the latter matter, professing that they might imperil the new occupants of the farms. Yet it is impossible, in the absence of some details, not to treat the Viceroy's statement with suspicion, the more so that, during the Vote of Censure debate in the House of Commons, the figures concerning the letting of derelict farms were deliberately withheld. And it is strange, in this connection, to hear of the surrender of a landlord like the Marquis of Conyngham to the Plan of Campaign. His lordship has just accepted from his Glenties tenantry, the rent, less the reduction first demanded by them. If we ask what are the further signs of progress, the answer is not very ready. Mr. J. E. Redmond has been sent to gaol, as was anticipated in our last article, and has been secretly removed from Wexford, where his brother remains in prison, to Tullamore. *Per contra*, Mr. Blane, M.P., like Mr. Dillon, has been released before the expiry of his sentence. His health was suffering, and Mr. Balfour found it necessary to open the prison doors. Yet Mr. Blane is unrepentant. He told his friends that he was anxious to continue the fight with the authorities, and Mr. Dillon has since made a speech of great length at a League meeting at Dublin, calling upon his countrymen to stick to the Plan of Campaign. Father McFadden, just liberated from Derry prison, is likewise contumacious; and Mr. O'Brien, who has had a prosecution hanging over his head for months, goes his course with all his wonted fire. Where is your firm Government, Mr. Balfour? Mr. O'Brien ought to have been laid by the heels long ago. And what about the newspaper proprietors, who, having gone to gaol, continue to infringe the law by publishing notices of meetings of the League, until, in one case, as Mr. O'Brien reminds us, penalties have been incurred mounting up to three centuries of imprisonment! Mr. Balfour may outrage all the decencies of public and private life by such speeches as that delivered at Glasgow, but his "courage" in attacking the memory of John Mandeville would have been more properly employed in other directions. It seems that he looks for success no longer in dealing with the leaders of the Irish agitation, but takes hope in a resolute attack upon the unfortunate wretches of the rank and file who happen to come into collision with the authorities. On no other ground can we account for the general increase recently in the length of the sentences passed by the Crimes Courts, rising, in the case of "Dr." Tully, who was one of Lord Clanricarde's

victims, to twelve months' imprisonment. Summary jurisdiction is being abominably abused. The House of Commons never supposed that two "Removables," sitting without a jury, should have this power. Mr. Chamberlain has the amazing courage to speak a word for Lord Clanricarde. His rents, it is said, are below the Government valuation. We will not question the statement. But, seeing that the Land Courts are still reducing rents as much as 32 per cent. in districts where cultivation goes on on immensely more favourable circumstances than on the hills around Woodford, Mr. Chamberlain's point is not very obvious. Finally, it may be observed that Mr. Balfour has been forced into taking action in regard to the verdict of the Mitchelstown jury in the Mandeville case. Of course it is action against the verdict. Having, within a few hours of the delivery of the verdict, publicly impugned the *bond fides* of the jury to the House of Commons, he necessarily continues on these lines. The Court of Queen's Bench is to be asked to quash the verdict, whilst Goulding, the ex-warder of Tullamore, whose evidence as to the stripping of Mr. Mandeville was largely concerned in founding the verdict, is being prosecuted for perjury. The Chief Secretary still declares the immaculate virtue of all Irish officialdom, and, being entirely untroubled with any popular sympathies, continues to do what is possible to him, heedless of the cries of human suffering and despair. Mr. Balfour is probably not an entirely callous person, but to half the people of the United Kingdom, and to the mass of the people of Ireland, he wears the aspect of a man with a heart of stone.

During the month we have had a striking illustration of the temper of the Liberal-Unionists towards Mr. Gladstone. It was at the Conference that preceded Mr. Chamberlain's Nottingham speech that Mr. Kimber, M.P.—himself a Unionist—offered a resolution, declaring that, as Mr. Gladstone had given up the exclusion of the Irish members from the Imperial Parliament, an attempt should be made to accommodate matters with him. The poor gentleman had hardly read his resolution to the end when he was overwhelmed with a burst of scorn and ridicule, in which he was told that he was no Unionist, and vigorously requested to leave the meeting. It need hardly be said that both Mr. Kimber and his resolution promptly disappeared. Yet we recall quite clearly a declaration by Mr. Chamberlain, that the acceptance by Mr. Gladstone of the principle of the retention of the Irish members at Westminster, would make it possible for him to vote for the second reading of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill. Mr. Kimber was no doubt ready to lead the meeting back to this circumstance; but he had forgotten how far his friends had gone the Tory road since then. Naturally they did not wish to be reminded of an ugly fact, and hence the collapse of Mr. Kimber and his resolution. The incident says a good deal for the temper of the gentlemen who never cease to denounce the in-

tolerance of their opponents. It is, too, a possible indication of the direction which the Unionists will ultimately take when they think of giving up their separate existence as a party. We Home Rulers can have no sort of hope concerning them.

Writing on the eve of the meeting of the Special Commission, which is to inquire into the charges of the *Times* against the Parnellites, we find the Attorney-General sticking to the brief given him by Mr. Smith's "old friend" Walter. It cannot, therefore, be too firmly insisted that the Government are concerned in the inquiry in the character of prosecutors. We reiterate our protest against what we conceive to be a rank scandal, and trust that the constituencies will not fail to take note of the circumstance. The particulars of persons charged, filed by the *Times* in obedience to the order of the Court, does not give us much information. Sixty-four of the eighty-five members of the Irish Parliamentary party are scheduled, but Mr. Davitt's name is omitted. And nowhere—if we exclude the question of the famous letters—is there a specific charge made against any one person or group of persons. This Bill of Particulars has been wittily and rightly dubbed a Bill of Generalities, and it seems inevitable that the Court will have to perform for itself the work which the *Times* has left undone. The proprietors of "the leading journal" (Heaven save the mark!) no doubt have a good deal of pressing work on hand. Mr. H. Campbell, M.P., has now issued a writ for libel against them, and they have just filed their defence to Mr. Parnell's Scotch action. Here they seek to evade trial by pleading that the day before the suit was entered at Edinburgh Mr. Parnell took out a writ against them in the English Queen's Bench, by alleging priority for this other action, and the general convenience and propriety of a hearing in London—where, as the *Times* thinks, it would be safe enough. These tactics do not give one the notion that the *Times* has a very strong faith in its own capacity to defeat Mr. Parnell before an impartial jury, and they give us hope for the success of the Irish party before the Special Commission. It is pleasant to notice that the fund which is being raised for the defence of Mr. Parnell and his colleagues has now reached the sum of £11,000.

The formation by Welsh Liberals of a Welsh National Council has given the friends of the Government much apparent satisfaction. We fail to find any solid ground for this complacency on their part. The Welsh National Council will, we are convinced, keep well within the lines of prudence in its relations with Welsh members, and in all other directions its work must certainly be useful. Its programme is "advanced," but not unreasonable. Welsh Home Rule is kept in reserve for a time, and the accomplishment of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church in Wales, the nationalization of the tithe, intermediate education, and a land reform, which shall allow the tenant to obtain the fixing of a fair

rent, must be matter of several years at the least. It cannot be begun short of a General Election, unless, indeed, the Government take up the education question. Meantime, Lord Salisbury's Tithes Bills are to be vehemently opposed, alike in Parliament and the country. In Wales the new County Boards are to be chosen on party lines. The National Council has suggested that candidates should not be accepted by the local Liberal Associations unless they are prepared to favour Welsh autonomy. But in England (if we except London) there is a laudable inclination rather to steer clear of party in the election of the Councils. Numerous noblemen and magistrates are coming forward for election, and there is prospect that the continuity of county administration, which has been economical enough, will be largely preserved.

Sir Morell Mackenzie's volume on *The Fatal Illness of Frederick the Noble* has caused a sensation. It is, from his point of view, an effective retort upon the German experts. But we cannot say that it altogether satisfies us. One broad fact remains: that the German doctors were right in their diagnosis, when Sir Morell was hesitating and doubtful, and that, if the Emperor ever had a chance of living through an operation for the removal of the growth—about which nobody has the slightest right to dogmatize—that chance was gone when the English specialist made up his mind to accept the conclusion of his German colleagues. Moreover, the book can hardly fail to add to the difficulty of the Empress Frederick's position in Germany. On the whole, we are inclined to think that Sir Morell might very well have been content to let the controversy stand where it did after the death of Frederick III.; and this we say, spite of the fact that we should have missed an admirably sympathetic description of a most noble and lofty character.

The Manchester meeting of the Church Congress leaves no great impression behind it. But what there is of remaining influence is decidedly good. Upon various matters the Church shows steady and sensible advance. The debate upon Eschatology was a sad disappointment to the adherents of the doctrine of eternal material punishment, and it was a surprise to not a few persons to hear Archdeacon Farrar claim for his own "broad" views the sympathy of the late Dr. Pusey. Again, the discussion on "The Bearing of Democracy on Church Life and Work" showed the Churchmen less scared than they used to be at the acquisition by the masses of political power and influence. There seems to be no fear of danger to the Church in the new régime, and the declaration of an American bishop, that the salvation of the democracy would best be found in "the democratic Church of God," obtained the warmest possible approval. The unusual success of the Manchester Congress must be largely attributed to the great work achieved for the Church and humanity by the late Bishop Fraser, whose memory will ever burn brightly throughout Lancashire.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by writers of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

IDEAL MARRIAGE.

THERE are few persons more depressing than the average optimist. 'Tis strange, but 'tis also true. He is a cheerful, practical being, with a good balance at his banker's, and probably a nice little place in the country. The world that provides him with roast mutton and champagne, arm-chair and slippers (embroidered by an admiring wife), is clearly the best of all possible worlds, and people who object to it ought to put themselves in the hands of a doctor—clearly, liver out of order, unless perchance, there is a taint of insanity in the family. "He that sinneth before his Maker, let him fall into the hand of the physician."

The sentiment seems fiendishly cruel, but the optimist is nothing if not resolute. He is "cruel only to be kind." Pessimists are morbid creatures who make themselves, and everybody around them, miserable. Hesitation is effeminate; mercy borders on weakness: the unwary pessimist lifteth up his voice—to the physician with him!

The optimist thinks there is no ground whatever for the modern outcry about—anything. The Sweating System might be a little more commissioned, but beyond that it is hard to see what people really can want. Whatever lamentations may be made, the optimist is shrewdly certain that there is gross exaggeration. Unhappy marriages? Well, perhaps there *may* be one here and there, but if so, there are faults on both sides, and the matter is of slight importance. Misery and starvation in our great cities? All nonsense. No man need lack the necessaries of life if he will only work hard enough, and take what wages he can get, and be thankful. The more thankful he is, the more necessaries he will get.

Our optimist points to the striking instance of his friend Brown,

who, entirely through his own exertions, achieved an excellent position, and now at the age of fifty-five has established himself in a charming residence in Upper Tooting, where he plies a garden-engine and grows peaches. So far from being sick and tired of his work, he feels quite lost without it, and has to grow more peaches than his family can be persuaded to eat, because he does not know how, otherwise, to occupy his leisure.

There is nothing to prevent every man from achieving the success of Mr. Brown of Tooting. This is indeed cheering at first sight. One pictures the East-end millions becoming each and all sternly industrious until they reach the age of fifty-five, and then—but the imagination gives way at this point, and we realize sadly that Mr. Brown's success depended, not upon the absolute amount of his industry, but upon its amount in relation to that of others. To raise the general standard so that each man works as hard as Mr. Brown, is not to multiply rewards, but merely to increase the garden-engines and the peaches of Mr. Brown. Thus do nearly all the optimist's theories prove delusions when they come to be examined.

The present marriage system being under the special protection of the friend of Mr. Brown, while the view which I advocate is diametrically opposed to all his dearest convictions, it becomes necessary to state very clearly the differences between us.

The friend of Mr. Brown believes in what may be called the pendulum theory of history; he sees in social movements a mere *oscillation*, a wave-like motion to and fro, without any real progress. As for the misery and vice in which the vast majority of mankind are plunged, that is eternal and inevitable.

The Meliorist believes, on the contrary, that there is a cure for these things, slow but certain, and that it lies, like a concealed treasure, in the sympathetic and rational impulses of man's nature, which may be developed, or "evolved," to so triumphant a dominion that they will finally subdue the savage and sensual instincts, even if they do not altogether destroy them. Anti-social feelings becoming weakened by heredity, the social sentiments will be able to hold them easily in check. "Education is the sum of habits."¹ This, then, is the theory upon which reader and writer must agree for the sake of argument. It is, in fact, the theory of evolution.

Evolution! the word awes us. We are like children frightened at our own shadows; like the shepherd on the Brocken who mistakes his own exaggerated image on the clouds that sweep over the mountain-summit for some angry spirit of the storm. There will come a time—it is close upon us—when the cloud image will cease to mean for us a storm-spirit more powerful than ourselves. We raise our arm, the shadow-form raises his arm also: he is our slave, we can command his every movement.

¹ *Heredity*. Ribot.

Belief in the power of man to choose his direction of change : this is the creed of the future, and it will soon come to be the distinctive mark of the essentially modern thinker.

Given this belief that man is arbiter of his own destiny, it becomes obviously right and possible to make an effort to realize even the most difficult of our ideals, knowing that if only it be in the true line of progress, the struggle towards it will bring us to higher ground, even should we fail to achieve what we are striving after exactly in the form we desired.¹ If we really *are* lords, and not slaves of the evolution spirit, it is surely possible to achieve freedom in marriage without giving reins to license.

At the present moment, indeed, the forces of barbarism are strong : the moral sense, though growing, is still feeble. Therefore, and *only* therefore, our desire is out of reach. We have to tolerate flaws in our institutions in order to avoid still greater evils which at present would follow a too determined attempt to act in harmony with abstract principle. This is no doubt a compromise, a deliberate contradiction between thought and practice ; necessary (although Count Tolstoi thinks otherwise²), as such compromises always are in our complex life, but none the less calling for dismissal as soon as we are able to overcome the evil without creating another still greater in its place.

We ought to sanction no compromise except for the sake of the ideal itself. For instance, freedom of marriage being our aim, we must yet submit to temporary bondage in deference to that very aim, because we know, or believe, that an attempt at complete emancipation would, in fact, create complete thralldom, and set us back upon the toilsome path of progress, perhaps for centuries. In our zeal for the cause of freedom, it is only too easy to sin against her. But every restraint which is placed upon the actions of men ought to be placed upon them in the name of liberty, whose spirit the average man does not yet understand. The true lover of freedom loves it for others as well as for himself, and he will never by a hair's-breadth encroach upon their rights or their privileges as free-born citizens of the world. It is only license which encroaches on the rights of others. When we have learnt this lesson, we shall be free men and women, obeying our own law of justice and of love.

Our present marriage system is coercive ; the marriage contract being the only contract which we have to submit to without having a voice in the framing of its conditions ; the only contract, moreover, which lasts for life. It is entirely arbitrary ; and nothing could

¹ "As it is true of individual beings, that their height in the scale of creation may be measured by their self-consciousness, so, in a sense, it is true of societies."—Herbert Spencer.

² See *Christ's Christianity*. Count Leo Tolstoi. Count Tolstoi believes that Christ's precepts ought to be interpreted literally, and followed without compromise at the present moment.

justify it except the certainty (which does not exist) that, without this coercion on the part of the State, we should have irresponsible coercion on the part of individuals; ill-treatment, for instance, of the children. No doubt this is the plea which would be made by the more enlightened advocates of the present system, but it cannot, as I think, be considered strong enough even at the moment, and every advance made by humanity in developing its sympathies steadily weakens the force of the plea, and renders it a mere obstruction, an excuse for sanctioning tyranny.

The injustice of forcing two people, on pain of social ostracism, either to accept the marriage contract as it stands or to live apart, is surely self-evident. If the contract were to be made more glaringly one-sided and absurd, every one would recognize the wrong. For instance—as the *Pall Mall Gazette* pointed out—if it were decreed that the woman, in order to be legally married, must gouge out her right eye, no sane person would argue that the marriage-contract was perfectly just, simply because the woman was at liberty to remain single if she did not relish the conditions. Yet this argument is used on behalf of the present contract, as if it were really any sounder in the one case than in the other. The existing conditions, being less obviously terrible, are put up with, but they remain unfair notwithstanding. Nobody is actually forced by police regulation to buy adulterated food, or to submit to any other iniquitous bargain; no man is forced to take a farm under conditions which he thinks unjust: yet we do not on that account consider food adulteration permissible or rack-renting blameless.

Certain aspects of the contract question are well brought out in a book which has been quoted against me, and the general drift of which cannot be said to be favourable to my view.

“‘If I signed a contract,’ Ideals explained, ‘and found out afterwards that those who induced me to become a party to it had kept me in ignorance of the most important clause in it, could you call that a moral contract?’”

“‘I should say that people had not dealt fairly with you,’ the Bishop avowed; ‘but there might be nothing in the clause to which you could object.’”

“‘But suppose there was something in the clause to which I very strongly objected, that was repugnant to my whole moral nature; and suppose I was forced by the law to fulfil it nevertheless, should you not say that in acting against my conscience I acted immorally?’”

“‘We all fell into the trap, and looked an encouraging assent.’”

“‘And in that case,’ she continued, ‘I suppose my duty would be to evade the law, and act on my own conscience. I should be only doing what the early martyrs had to do.’”

“‘But I don’t see what particular contract you are thinking of,’ said the lawyer.

“‘The marriage contract,’ Ideala answered calmly.”¹

Ideala further alarms the Law and the Church by insisting that, “only the love that lasts can sanctify marriage, and a marriage without such love is an immoral contract.”

The Bishop becomes piteous, and promises to preach a sermon next Sunday on the subject. If he succeeded in showing that Ideala was wrong in her opinion, he must have been a shining light and a pillar of the Church indeed!

Surely no one will seriously deny that Ideala's principle is perfectly right, and that to substitute a legal form for the sentiment that possesses the real binding force between two persons, is to found our kingdom upon sand, to base our social world upon a mockery and a sham. Why, then, this tempest of indignation? “Why do the heathen so furiously rage together?” Half the letters in the *Daily Telegraph* make the very same protest that I made against our system of false marriages—mercenary and thoughtless marriages, encouraged by a mercenary and thoughtless society; only the letter-writers blame, not the social order, but the victims of that order: the unfortunate girls whose horizon is as limited as their opportunities, whose views of life are “cribbed, cabined, and confined” by their surroundings, whose very right and wrong, just and unjust, are chosen for them. They act as they are taught to act; behaving precisely as every average person behaves in all conditions of life—viz., in exact obedience to the public opinion of his little world.

“Yes, marriage is often a failure,” say the letter-writers reproachfully; “it is entered into too early, too thoughtlessly, without (on the part of the wife) a knowledge of cooking and the domestic arts, without a flawless temper, without absolute immunity from headaches. Society and the institution of marriage are not to blame, only the faulty individuals who marry.”

Poor much instructed, much badgered, much belaboured individuals! Like the absent, you are always in the wrong! The last person I should feel inclined to blame for the marriage failure is the girl who acts according to universal example and precept.

It is impossible for an outsider to realize the restrictions and narrowness of the average girl's life. We are too near to the result to be able to see it. When some one points out to us that the education has been distorting, we, on our side, point beamingly to some of its disastrous consequences and say, “Behold the Eternal has so willed it.” The past is an open secret, the future may be foreseen; it is the *present* that remains for ever the impenetrable mystery. Truly we know not what to do. It is well, however, that we should be told!

“Evils,” as Ish says, in his imaginary dialogue with Adam,² “will

¹ *Ideala: A Study from Life.*

² *Education of Girls.* Dalton.

not be cured by being shrugged at and hushed up; on the contrary, the more you whitewash the outside, the more the inside will fester." The inner festering is becoming very bad indeed, and—awful to think of—the wonderful resources of British whitewash, applied with all the ardour of the British matron and her disciples, are beginning to give out. We have fallen on evil times! Whitewash growing thin over ugly sores, and more and more whitewash perpetually called for. What, in the name of Podsnap, is to become of the Young Person? Poor pathetic Young Person! incarcerated within those grim Podsnapian walls; your nature dwindling, shrivelling, rotting, day by day, like some cankered fruit-tree; weighed down by stupid authority, overshadowed by shams, tainted by false virtues, false shame, artificial sins, subject to the insults of all the hosts of the Philistine—the manifold vulgarities, which swarm vermin-like, beneath the coarse propriety and proper coarseness delightful to the soul of Mrs. Grundy! If one could but open those heavy doors for you, would you come out into the wholesome sunshine and fill your lungs with warm and living-atmosphere? or has Podsnap set up his idols in the very heart of you, so that you return timidly, as the old man in the Bastille to his cell, and tell out the days of your youth under the shadow of the Podsnapian wings (if a winged Podsnap can be compassed by the imagination)?

And this is the bewildered being, stunted in intelligence, in self-respect; frightened, indoctrinated, sermonized, with a swollen unwholesome conscience spreading in all directions like some rankly growing gourd, increasing not in harmony with, but at the expense of, the other sides of the nature—this is the ill-treated being who is held responsible for the failure of marriage; this is the victim to whom a logical and consistent society says: "My dear, marry, and ask no questions: who are you that you should criticize an institution which has lasted for centuries? Marriage is your natural and proper career—your own highly developed conscience must tell you so. If you do not adopt it, well, we fear you will find cause to regret your decision, and your gourd-like mentor will give you no repose. If you can't get a husband we are extremely sorry for you, and we fear that your good parents will regard you as a failure, and your friends may not feel the same hesitation in treating you—always with perfect good breeding—as a supernumerary who has no place in the world, who has been rejected and cast out from among the actors in the drama of life." So the bewildered being turns an alarmed ear to the counsel that greets her on every side, in one form or another, open or disguised; for it is not only from the lips of worldlings that these warnings issue; they are presented in great numbers between texts of Scripture and precepts of morality as a sort of moral sandwich, whereof they occupy the central post of honour. Society knows better than to appeal merely to the instincts of self-preservation and worldly ambition in a being possessing such

a magnificent overgrowth of conscience, and such a divine humility of spirit. The being can be led, she need not be driven. Society appeals to her Gourd, and wins an easy victory. The being marries (the Gourd warmly approving). But alas! the marriage turns out unhappily. There is no sympathy between the pair; the wife means well—what else has she a Gourd for?—but her ability falls below the level of her intentions. She continues to pave the floors of the infernal regions. Things go from bad to worse; the husband yields to temptation; there is little or no influence in his home to counteract it; the wife suffers, and says nothing. In nine cases out of ten she lets no one into the secret of her unhappiness; her husband is the last person to guess how lonely and how sad her life is. "Until a woman cries, men never think she is suffering; bless their block-headism!" exclaims Mrs. Carlyle.

Though, as a rule, an unhappy marriage means utter shipwreck of the woman's life, while the husband can find interest and consolation outside the home, both lives in fact are injured, not necessarily through any inherent and determined "cussedness" in either of the pair, but through want of suitability, intelligence, tact, and, above all, through a lack of tolerance, not only for one another's faults and failings, but also for one another's tastes and ideas. The attempt to check any little signs of individuality which may appear in either of the couple, on the ground that husband and wife ought to be perpetually subordinating their particular desires and interests to the will of the other, is perhaps one of the most fatal causes of unhappiness in marriage, and is certainly one of the most potent factors in the creation of dull homes, and torpid monotonous lives. Out of such homes springs a second crop of bewildered beings, whose only sin is obedience, but upon whose shoulders "right-thinking" people pile almost all the blame of our unsuccessful marriages. Not only the absent, but the sinned-against are always in the wrong.

To encourage a child to put a lighted match to a train of gunpowder, and then to punish him severely because he has caused a disastrous explosion, is not the act of a just person. We really shall come to see this, if we go on progressing at our present break-neck speed.¹

Since the publication in the *Daily Telegraph* of the excellent letters on the dulness of our British middle-class homes, it is unnecessary to dwell upon this important aspect of the question. "There is no place like home!"—and a good thing too!" some contributor to *Punch* recklessly exclaims.

Not only the reform in home and social life, but also the reform in education can be dealt with, more or less, by each of us, for educa-

¹ "Instead of boiling up individuals into the species, I would draw a chalk line round every individuality, and preach to it to keep within that, and to preserve and cultivate its identity at the expense of ever so much lost gilt of other people's 'isms.'" —Jane Welsh Carlyle.

tion goes on all day long, in play-time as well as during the hours of study. It is sad to think of the thousands of little boys and girls imbibing, with every breath they draw, ideas that are barbarous and irrational. The savage and aggressive instincts are cultivated in boys from the cradle (their very toys are sham instruments of destruction); while the poor little girls learn those lessons of abject self-suppression and humility of which I have already spoken at length.

Would that we could place above all the copy-book precepts of the nursery and the schoolroom Professor Clifford's aphorism: "There is only one thing worse than the desire to command, and that is the will to obey."

Disobedience, in the present crisis of affairs, is woman's first duty! "That will lose her her power," some one exclaims, "the power that she now possesses—the sceptre which, if cleverly wielded, might move the world." "Yes," we reply; "a power that is won by smiles and wiles and womanly devices; and, when won, is hers, not by right but by favour. This is the power, not of a free being, but of a favourite slave." When shall we come to see that such a conception of woman's position and influence is mean, ignoble, *ugly*, through and through? When shall we banish these remnants of Eastern despotism from our homes, these haunting whispers from lands which we profess to despise, where women are shut up in harems, denied all human rights, and are forced to acquire what power they may attain, through cunning and deceit, and the meanest arts of flattery? We *are* outgrowing these conceptions; but oh, how slowly! Hamerton, the author of the *Intellectual Life*, is one of the few men who have entirely outgrown them. "If the reader," he says, "has ever had a travelling companion, some person totally unsuited to his nature, and quite unable to enter into the ideas that chiefly interest him; unable to see even the things that he sees, and always ready to treat negligently or contemptuously the thoughts and preferences that are most his own; he will have some faint conception of what it must be to find oneself tied to an unsuitable companion for the tedious journey of this mortal life: and if, on the other hand, he has ever enjoyed the pleasure of wandering through a country that interested him, along with a friend who could understand his interest and share it, and whose society enhanced the charm of every prospect, and banished dullness from the dreariest inns, he may, in some poor and imperfect degree, realize the happiness of those who have chosen the life companion wisely."

The following quotations point to the fact or theory, that while we are burdened with our present ideas about matrimony, it is necessarily more or less unhappy if one of the pair happens to possess an original bent of mind, still more so if that originality is accompanied by exceptional talent. "High intellect is in itself a pecu-

liarity, in a certain sense it is really an eccentricity, even when so thoroughly sane and rational as in the cases of George Eliot and Mill. It is an eccentricity in this sense, that its mental centre does not coincide with that of ordinary people—if there is the touch of original talent or genius in one of the parties, it is sure to result in many ideas that will lie outside of any local common-sense, and then the other party, living in that sense, will consider those ideas peculiar and perhaps deplorable. Here then are elements of dissension lying quite ready, like explosive materials—the merest accident may shatter in a moment the whole fabric of affection.”

We ought all to be taught, at the same time as we learn to say “please” and “thank you,” and not to make a grab during meals at some tit-bit upon which we have set our hearts, that to respect the freedom of opinion and of action in others—not even excepting our relations or our life-companion—is one of the first duties of civilized life, the neglect of which is sheer aggression and impertinence. Hamerton points out that, in order to keep the peace and imitate successful marriage, “the more enlightened and intelligent of the two parties has to stifle half his nature.”

O admirable institution of marriage which thus watches over the interests of society, and strangles discreetly those of her members who are able to instil fresh life into her, and to keep her pure and sane and sound! The policy resembles that of a gardener, who should snap off the leading shoots of his young pine tree!

This tendency, in fact, constitutes the great danger of the age. We deify the average. Unless a rebellion against this idol shortly takes place, we shall sink into a condition of *bourgeois* Philistinism, which makes one's hair stand on end to contemplate.

If a desperate person under that *régime* committed bigamy or trigamy, or any other crime, for a diversion, he would certainly do it under what a friend of Mrs. Carlyle calls “attenuating circumstances.”

Mrs. Grundy in black silk, with a sceptre in her hand, on the throne of the ages, supported by an angel-choir of Young Persons! Is this to be the end of our democracy? There are ominous signs of it. One is forced regretfully to acknowledge the fidelity to Nature of the description in the *Nonsense Songs and Stories* of the visiting acquaintance of the seven unfortunate families, which we are told “was very numerous, and distinguished, and select, and responsible, and ridiculous.”¹

Matters are becoming serious. Poetry survives in the heavy atmosphere only with an effort; romance languishes; painting and sculpture are distinguished by “a serene and sickly suavity only known to the truly virtuous.”

This is in spite of an under-stirring among the stronger spirits in

¹ Edward Lear.

all branches of art, as if the smothered genius of the age were struggling to throw off the mighty incubus of British Philistinism. For our life we must not let that effort fail.

We must consent to give play to the individual, or our democratic institutions will plunge us into a slavery from which there is no redemption. We shall find ourselves in leading strings to the "practical man," the friend of Mr. Brown, mediocrity personified. In our imagined safeguards against tyranny lurks our greatest danger. We stand confronted with what a master of mixed metaphor calls, "barricades in sheep's clothing"!

It is in deference to our deity—"the greatest number"—that wives are exhorted to endure the miseries, even the indignities, of an unhappy marriage, rather than weaken by their rebellion the power of the legal tie.

In short, the rights of minorities are absolutely *nil*, in spite of the fiction that all citizens stand equal before the law; the sufferings of the exceptional person, whether as regards character or circumstance, being disregarded on the ground that they happen seldom, though their rarity is after all a pure assumption.

The infrequency of an occurrence, in any case, does not in the slightest degree alter the nature or bitterness of the sufferings; if an evil is intolerable, it is equally so whether one or many suffer it, and society is not just but tyrannical when it asks its members to endure it in silence. There are miseries which no one ought to be called upon to endure by the laws of his country, which every human being is justified in resisting at all hazards, and in spite of every law, written or unwritten. Passive endurance in such cases is not for the good of the "greatest number"; it is simply for the degradation of human dignity and the torture of human souls, and by that the "greatest number" never reaped a benefit. Even if it did, it ought not to exact this awful sacrifice. Of what value is the "good of the community," if in that community individuals can suffer thus under the wing of the Law? What is the meaning of the term, "the welfare of society," if not the comfort and security of the individuals composing it?

There is no virtue in mere *number*. It is an abstraction, an unreality. We have still to learn that the only things that actually exist are individual cases, and that it is men and women—John and Jemima—who suffer, and not abstract masses which we call, for convenience, the greater or the less.

Marriage by free contract would help to prevent the immolation of minorities and the injury to the majority which all such sacrifices really inflict. It is impossible to wound one part of the social organism without hurting the whole, just as, happily, one cannot make one person healthier, nobler, and more reasonable without bestowing the same qualities in some slight degree upon the commonwealth of which he is a member.

There is yet another aspect of the question that ought not to be overlooked.

Laws are intended to restrain people from sinning against the life and welfare of others; they are not instituted for the purpose of forcing a rich crop of heroes and Christian martyrs. A man or woman may regard it as an imperative duty to accept martyrdom in marriage in order to show reverence for the institution, or for the majesty of the law. Within limits, the State is ready to permit self-immolation; but it goes altogether beyond its sphere when it demands it of the average human being.

The law has no business to require martyrdom from any one. That is a matter to be settled with a man's own conscience. It is a most common and dangerous mistake to suppose that because a course of action may be in accordance with the highest morality, the law is justified in making that action compulsory. The question for the State to decide is rather negative than positive. It ought to decree what its members may *not* do, rather than what they *must* do. A man may take upon himself a duty which would be ludicrous for the State to require of him—such, for instance, as adopting and educating the orphan children of a friend.

In the same way, a woman may regard it as a duty to endure the worst miseries of an unhappy marriage, although conscious that she has been forced or persuaded into it, when not experienced enough to judge for herself. But that is her own affair; the State has no right to force upon her the martyrdom which her conscience induces her to take upon herself.

We are told very often—and this has never been disputed—that society is not in a state to admit of the successful establishment of free marriage. Clearly, it is not; but, equally clearly—if we are satisfied that it is theoretically right—the best thing we can do is to try our hardest to make it so. That is a mere matter of common-sense. We have to do this, however, without endangering the ideal of monogamy which we have already placed before us, and which experience has shown to be the only form of sex-relationship which permits the progress of the race. Many polygamous countries have been happy and orderly enough, but they have remained in a state of ignorance and barbarism, while their women have occupied a very degraded position, rendering advance in civilization practically impossible. Reformers cannot be too careful, but neither can they be too persistent. Whatever is good and true in the present idea of marriage ought to be clung to, but there must be no sentimental timidity in attacking the cunning and insidious evils that fly to sanctuary, and conceal themselves, behind the high altar of the sacred institution. These must be hunted out without mercy. Herbert Spencer emphatically insists on the supreme importance of monogamy for the progress of the

race. "It is clear," he says, "that monogamy has long been growing innate in the civilized man. For all the ideas and sentiments now associated with marriage have, as their inspiration, singleness of union." He traces an interesting connexion between polygamy and the militant type of society, and between monogamy and industrialism; he shows that war is the enemy of monogamy and of woman. War, in killing off so many young men, brings about that inconvenient disparity between the numbers of the sexes, which creates many of our present difficulties, and makes complete freedom in the marriage contract a sheer impossibility. We find, then, that all modern reforms—notably those in the direction of international intercourse, brotherly co-operation and peace—tend towards the same distant goal beyond our present horizon, and that no ideal can possibly be realized by itself—a solitary space of calm in a raging sea—but only in connexion, direct and indirect, with the other ideals of the age. All that substitutes knowledge for ignorance, insight for stupidity, sympathy for aggression, love for indifference, moves towards salvation.

My first article, which covered too much ground to allow details to be worked out, was intended to lay down general principles, and to suggest ideas rather than to justify them. The amount and the kind of restriction which the State ought to consider necessary to protect the welfare of its members, is one of the most difficult questions in the whole range of politics, and it could not be touched upon in a paper which attempted a history of marriage, however brief.

It is better, according to my view, to suffer some evils, than to cure them at the expense of individual freedom, because to curtail that freedom is to cut away part of the foundation of further progress. Freedom is more valuable than even a great benefit thrust upon us against our will. Better to endure (while trying to cure) evils which are inevitable when half-educated people are at liberty to blunder "at large," than sink into a nation of children spoon-fed by a paternal government.¹ Germany, for instance, will have to grow up before she can take any step of real progress. She must achieve liberty to make a fool of herself, and having done so, to think better of it, and go forward as a nation capable of self-direction and self-control.

In writing my first article, I took it for granted that by "marriage"

¹ "We have strong ground for believing that permanence in marriage relations is a mark of a higher civilization and higher types of character. But do not let us forget that the outward union must be based upon the inward union. If union be only the result of external authority, or power of external kind, it becomes a mere superstition, a fetter. There can be nothing which so lowers our view of marriage as the belief that for the imagined good of society two people whose lives and aims are inharmonious should, by a sort of external coercion, be bound together; as if society had ever been benefited by sacrificing the individual. Here, as everywhere else, freedom must be our guide. In all great matters of human feeling, not only the higher forms, but even the conception of the higher forms, can only be reached through freedom."—Auberon Herbert.

would be understood the life union of a man and a woman, as that is the sense in which we always use the term in this country. But in case of further misunderstanding in a different direction, I must state that there is, as I think, no rational limit to the principle of liberty; moderation in liberty is as ridiculous as moderation in truth, or health, or happiness, or love, or any other of the elements that "make for righteousness" in this world. Absolute liberty, then, in the relations of men and women, is indeed the ideal; a limited ideal is as ludicrous as a limited belief in the axioms of geometry. But we can go to the utmost length of the principle, as a principle, without in the least ignoring the fact dwelt upon earlier in this paper, that the State cannot fully carry out principles purely abstract, because the material in which it has to work is, to say the least of it, imperfect. The State, therefore, in registering and enforcing contracts between men and women, must make the stipulation that they use the word marriage in the national sense: that is, as a life-long union, provided the terms of the contract are kept faithfully. A temporary union may not be in itself necessarily vicious or evil, but the State cannot register it, because it does not come under the definition of marriage. That is the difference between free-marriage and promiscuity, and the distinction holds good even in the case of a union entered into for life without any State registration at all. If, on the other hand, a couple change their minds, and part to marry again, and yet again, then they have placed themselves in a different social category, and can no longer call any of their temporary unions marriage in the national sense. Again, on exactly the same grounds, the State cannot be called upon to register and protect a contract in which the couple select merely frivolous and ridiculous reasons for divorce, because that is an evident attempt to make a temporary contract and not a permanent one, and to claim for it the name of State-ratified marriage.¹ In a still distant condition of society, however, it is probable that unions may exist outside the law, but inside society; men and women caring only for the real bond between them, and treating as of quite minor importance the artificial or legal tie. So that gradually the State may come to have very little part in marriages. It is a mere question of the growth of the principle of liberty, the strengthening of the social feeling at the expense of the anti-social. The tendency will be gradually to substitute internal for external law; the worship of liberty for the worship of self; social sentiment for anti-social license.²

¹ Everything has its comic side. "On accuse Henri VIII.," says Madame de Flamarell, alluding to his treatment of his wives; "moi, je le comprends, et je l'absous; c'était un cœur généreux; lorsqu'il ne les aimait plus, il les tuait." This is carrying the doctrine of the sanction by affection almost too far!

² "Changes which may further facilitate divorce under certain conditions are changes which will make these conditions more and more rare."—*Principles of Sociology*, vol. i. chap. xii.

This movement towards freedom, this tendency to lay more stress on the real bond than on the artificial, can be studied to good purpose by comparing different countries. Wherever we find affection in marriage regarded as essential, or desirable, there we have a higher form of society, a higher level of morality, and, above all, a more progressive tendency. Beginning with pure savagery we pass on to more or less civilized countries in different stages of development: India, Persia, China, Turkey, Italy, Germany, France, America, and England (the list is not intended to be arranged in order of precedence). The rule holds good, more or less strictly, in all these cases. And now the foremost countries have to go a step further, and emphasize still more the importance of the bond of affection and friendship, and the baseness of a union sanctioned only by a mere legal formality.¹

In connection with this part of the subject Mrs. Carlyle's delightful comment must not be forgotten. "I do think," she says, "there is much truth in the German idea, that marriage is a shockingly immoral institution, as well as what we have long known it for—an extremely disagreeable one."

Also for our souls' sake let us contemplate the idea of the Mrs. Grundys of the Zambesi being horribly shocked when they heard of the English custom of monogamy. The Makalolo women, according to Livingstone, did not think it at all respectable. No doubt they hurried all their young persons out of ear-shot as rapidly as they could!²

Marriage has been defined as a contract between two persons and the State. Because of the children the State is said to have a special concern in the matter.

This is no doubt true, but it means rather less than is generally supposed.

The State has a concern in everything that affects a human being, down to the minutest details of his daily life. It matters to the State every time a man smokes more cigars than are good for him, every time a woman pinches in her waist. It matters to the State very much when men grow absorbed in the business of money-making, and have no time or ability to assist in the development of a higher type of manhood. It matters to the State perhaps even more when women give themselves up wholly to the care of their households and the rearing of their children, rendering themselves unfit for their task, and sending forth into the already over-

¹ A philosopher of Truro, Mr. Cragoe, says: "We are not gods, but imperfect short-sighted creatures, passing through a life where change is legible upon the face of all created things" (even upon the face of our marriage institutions); "whilst marriages are made in heaven," he adds, "the bonded miseries of our mortal existence are often made in the hell of our own conventions."

² In a letter from Dr. C. Fayette Taylor of New York, occur the following words: "It has been the fashion for Englishmen and writers to allude sneeringly (as if the fact necessarily carried an implied censure) to the divorce laws obtaining in most of the States of the American Union, without stopping to inquire as to the actual facts of the case." The writer goes on to say that "the persons directly involved and the communities . . . are gainers by these laws."

burdened world, swarms of ill-trained, stupid, prejudiced human beings, whose influence upon their fellows is evil and retrograde.

All these things concern the State nearly, but the State cannot send inspectors into our homes to count the cigars of the men, and inquire into the system of education adopted by the women.

In the marriage contract the State has a deep concern, but it does not follow therefrom that it has a right to interfere.

When the parents begin to starve and abandon their children the State naturally steps in to protect its helpless members, but *until* the couple sin in that way why should the State make up its mind that they intend to do so? It might at least give them the benefit of the doubt.

There are plenty of laws to protect children from ill-treatment, under which the parents would be punished when the offence was committed. Why then interfere with the freedom of contract in advance, on the assumption that the parents are certain to commit this cruelty?

The children appear to be regarded as the principal difficulty in the introduction of new marriage laws, although this is a Protestant country where divorce is allowed, and where in consequence the question has already had to be faced. It is strange too that this has not long ago been regarded as a difficulty quite apart from all questions of divorce. The child of average parents is sacrificed in the most ruthless manner to tradition, ignorance, and prejudice, yet nobody comes to the rescue. Marriage is a "sacred" institution, and it does not matter what goes on under cover of its sanctity!

It is assumed that a child's welfare is sacrificed when the parents cease to live together (even if they habitually pelt one another with crockery). This idea will probably, before long, come to be looked upon as a superstition. In fact, there is a vast amount of superstition clinging about all our ideas regarding the relations of parent and child, and of domestic life generally, the superstition leading to a complicated system of self-sacrifice through which the amiable group mingle at last in a general holocaust, whose fumes rise to heaven in invocation of the family deities.

Why this universal slaughter of driven cattle? Will not the gods be otherwise appeased? If we did but know it, the more they are fed, the greedier they become.

Is the usual relation between fathers and sons such that one can imagine the son's existence blighted by the removal of the paternal influence? As a rule, the best influence in a boy's or a young man's life comes to him outside the home. He is respectful to, and perhaps fond of, his mother; but he does not (poor fellow, he cannot) treat her as a friend. She knows nothing, understands nothing; she has close-set, narrow little ideas, trim little maxims, wise little copy-book precepts to suggest as solutions to the hard problems of life. In

short, our present parental and filial relations, taking the average of parents and children, are not so admirable as to make it worth while—even if it were just—to bind together husband and wife in a life-long bondage, and to sacrifice the freedom of the marriage relation. To make this sacrifice of the man and the woman, for the sake of providing the children at all hazards with a constant supply of parents, is unjust and inexpedient. It would be so, even if divorce necessarily implied that children and parents were to be parted for ever, which it does *not*. Divorced parents, of course, are bound equally with other parents to provide for their children, and to entrust their training to competent hands—a condition, by the way, which they by no means always fulfil while they remain united. They are bound to see that all is well done in this respect, but they are not bound to remain under one roof in order that their children may enjoy the convenience of having both parents simultaneously within easy reach.

There is not sufficient ground in experience for believing that the mother and father are certain or even likely to be the best trainers for their children. Surely, it cannot be denied that the average mother is totally unfitted for her difficult and most important task. How many women, according to popular notions, make good step-mothers? Yet no woman who has so little sense of justice as to treat children less kindly because they are not her own, is fit to bring up children at all. There is no reason for surprise that the ordinary mother should not understand principles whose application demands time and study which can only be bestowed on the business of one's life; but none the less do the children suffer, none the less are they defrauded of the inheritance of the ages. They ought to be habitually in the society of those who not only have special sympathy with young minds and a special gift for attracting their love and confidence, but a thorough knowledge of the laws of health and of mental and moral development. During a certain portion of the day—for instance, that which is now presided over by nurses—all little girls and boys might enjoy the advantage of coming within the influence of such "heaven-born" friends of children. Nature, be it remembered, takes no count of *motives*: a child suffers just as much from the mistakes of a devoted mother, as it suffers from wilful ill-treatment. We ought to consider, also, the enormous amount of energy that would be set free in our homes by this extension of the principle of the division of labour.¹ Only by division of labour, really excellent work is possible; only, therefore, by breaking down our old idea that the mother should always take charge of her child, or rather

¹ Fourier hit upon a profound truth when he placed at the foundation of his social system the "attractions passionées" of its members. Are there not many women among the hordes that now have to make their own living who would feel this "passionate attraction" to the work of sympathetic education (it is more than "education" in the usual acceptation of the word)? And could they not be trained, perhaps by means of a college, to this important task, which no one but those really fitted by nature and education ought to dream of undertaking?

that she should not allow one more competent than herself to do so. Some one *less* competent, as, for instance, the average nursemaid—who has not even maternal affection as a motive for good treatment—is not objected to by popular feeling.¹

And now for a suggestion which will appear, at first sight, to contradict the foregoing. I would propose that this system of educating from infancy by specialists should be prolonged when boys and girls grow older, and that, if possible, they should continue to spend part of their time in their own homes, and not be sent away to public schools at a distance. While the mother would partly surrender her child's training to more able hands, the home-influence might, nevertheless, be much longer preserved in the boy's life (of course a girl has it, and too much of it, till she marries).²

And now, supposing such a system to become general, groups of from eight to ten children received daily by cultivated women in their own homes, wherein lies the special difficulty about the children of divorced parents? The agreement in the contract would arrange how they were to be educated, and with whom they were to live, for how long, and so forth, down to the minutest details. Divorce, it must be repeated, need not part parents and children, though if such parting should become necessary (as it sometimes does without divorce), there would be real homes for the children to go to, preferable beyond all comparison to the houses of relatives or friends. Some day we shall look back with amazement at our folly in giving the raw material of society into ignorant hands, to be mangled and destroyed; some day a mother's affection will show itself, not in industrious self-sacrifice, which reduces her to a pulpy nonentity, feeble in body and mind, and generally ends in bringing her child to a similar condition; but in a resolve to take the full advantage of all that science is busily providing for those who will accept her bounties. The mother will recognize at the same time that self-immolation is obsolete, even among Indian widows, and that, as a civilized human being, she is acting immorally when she voluntarily permits herself—a unit of society—to degenerate in mind or body.

When the hour strikes, when the conscience of women is re-directed, and the aspect of her duty changes, the prophetic saying of Emerson will be at last understood—"We shall one day learn to supersede politics by education."

¹ It is fully admitted that the mother is at present practically forced to be satisfied with incompetent substitutes; her duties compel it; but that is exactly what calls for reform. How many Anglo-Indians, for instance, obliged to leave their children in England, would be thankful if there existed, all through the country, establishments under the care of educated, high-minded women, where children might be left with the certainty that the best training which the most advanced knowledge of the century afforded would be theirs.

² When the mother is no longer head-nurse, children's governess, and general attendant, as well as housekeeper and performer of social duties, she would have time to make herself efficient in her various pursuits, so that home-influences would be far more worth having than they generally are at present.

With regard to the custody of children and the respective claims of the parents, current ideas are scarcely on a higher plane than they were centuries ago when women were openly and ostensibly treated as the property of men.

Just as the slave-girl belongs to her master, with all the children that she may have, so the wife belongs to her husband, and her children also. According to the odious current phrase, the wife "presents" her lord with a son or a daughter. This mode of regarding the matter is surely a conclusive argument against the doctrine of inborn moral ideas. The mother undergoes weariness and torture during her best years; she risks her health, her life, her reason, and very frequently bids farewell to physical well-being and buoyancy of mind altogether through the perpetual strain, anxiety, and worry entailed by the cares of a family.

Yet high-minded men—and women too—see no injustice or hardship in depriving a mother of the child that has cost her so dearly; they claim for the father equal rights in deciding its destiny, and indeed many people actually go so far as to consider them superior to the mother's. Clearly our ideas of morality are the offspring of custom, and have nothing to do with an "eternal principle" planted within our hearts. It must be a strange sort of "eternal principle" which would sanction our present barbarous notions. It is often urged indeed that since the father works for his children and provides for their food and education, he ought to have the supreme authority over them. But it is forgotten that every woman—speaking generally—who is at the head of a house, works at least as hard, in a different way, as her husband, and that this makes them quits so far, although the woman's work is not paid for and is therefore underrated.

Over and above that unpaid labour, the wife has borne and reared the children, and from the very nature of the case has therefore a superior claim. An uncle or a friend might work for the children far harder than the father ever works, but he could not by that means assume rightful authority to direct their career, although the parents would naturally take the benefactor into their counsels. The mother's right rests upon her unique relationship to the child. The sentiment of justice insists that every one shall enjoy the results of his toil and suffering, and if this sentiment is listened to the supreme authority must certainly be assured to the mother in cases of dispute. The bread-winner, of course, has a strong claim to be consulted, and in practice there would seldom be any need to consider these points of justice; things would arrange themselves; nevertheless, they ought to be thought out and decided, and if the plan of offering a choice of contracts to couples should come to be adopted, these are questions which would require very careful and unprejudiced consideration.

Religion, philosophy, commerce, industrial methods, and all the

departments of science and art are open to criticism and re-direction according to the needs and desires of the age; even domestic life must submit to be scrutinized, even the institution of marriage cannot remain motionless on its pedestal while other things are moving on.

Our present twin-system of marriage and prostitution will be attacked from different stand-points, but the attack will be persistent, and the blows thick and fast. Prostitution is as inseparable from our present marriage customs as the shadow from the substance. They are the two sides of the same shield, and not the deepest gulf that ever held human beings asunder can prevent the burning vapours of the woman's Inferno which is raging beneath our feet, from penetrating into the upper regions of respectability and poisoning the very atmosphere.

Practical people think the Inferno necessary, and that the higher and happier marriage is a dream impossible to realize. The twin-system they believe must go on eternally, the division of women into two great classes, both necessary to the community (on the "practical" hypothesis); the one class deliberately cut off, as far as "society" has any say in the matter, from hope and from help for evermore.

The same idea—the purchase of womanhood—in more or less attractive garb, under more or less attractive conditions, rules from base to summit of the social body. "But the world is blind, and every redemption must be purchased with blood."

Like "Nature" in her singular "Dialogue with a stranger"¹ society might exclaim, looking back to her former state: "What I now am was once, even as a hope, a great way off. If I had hope then I may well hope now. I was once a mere boiling cauldron of horrible confusion under darkness and tempest; and passions and forces raged through and through me; yet I hoped even then, and all along through the wild ages I hoped on. The worst is past."

The worst is past because we have fixed our eyes upon the morning, because, after all these centuries of conflict, *sympathy* has been born into the world! "Life is comic and pitiful as soon as the high ends of being fade out of sight and man becomes near-sighted and can only attend to what addresses the senses." But this near-sightedness disappears at the command of sympathy, which discloses to all eyes the universal tragedy which has no last act, and upon which no curtain falls. It is only by love, led by knowledge, that the world can be saved. We are all actors in this great and mysterious tragedy, and our hope is in each other. If we lose our unity, we lose everything. But we shall *not* lose our unity; the spirit of it is growing and spreading far and wide; it means a new era, a new departure in the history of the world. At the very root of our

¹ *Morgenröthe*. John Pulsford.

social life, in the relations of man to woman, we shall place sympathy and freedom, and from that source will spring, in the good time that is coming, the universal brotherhood.

This is Utopian? Then the world is incapable of moral government, then the friend of Mr. Brown is the true philosopher. The hopes, the aspirations, the struggles of the noblest men and women have been futile; the Devil reigns, and Love has been cheated of his own.

In vain has he pleaded; in vain have the tears of anguish and pity been shed; in vain is the day of woman's redemption drawing near. With shouts and empty laughter we have crucified this saviour who has come into the world to redeem it; we have nailed him to the cross of our laws and our conventions, and left him there among our shams and our whited sepulchres in lonely passion to bear our sins upon his shoulders, to suffer for our blindness, our self-complacence, our stupid false humility. Making indolence a virtue, we have laughed and gone our way, leaving the saviour of men to agonize through the long and awful darkness of the night. How much longer must he bear it, who deserts us not even in the hour of his bitterest anguish? When will men consent to their redemption?

MONA-CAIRD.

CENTENARY CELEBRATIONS IN 1788.

As the year 1888 is passing away, it is interesting for a moment to look back over a century and see what our ancestors were doing to celebrate the double event which distinguishes the year '88. Englishmen are not good at remembering historical dates, but we have been sufficiently reminded by Mr. Augustus Harris and by the people of Plymouth that in 1588 the Spanish Armada was defeated, and those of us who have recently referred to our histories may recollect that in 1688 James II. was driven from his throne. By the first event our national independence in religion and politics was preserved from a serious danger; by the second, Roman Catholic bigotry and Stuart despotism were together expelled, and the system of parliamentary government was permanently established. Curiously enough, in the present year of 1888, it is the former event, with all its dramatic surroundings, which alone excites our rather mild enthusiasm, while the more prosaic and more partisan conflict of the Revolution appears almost paltry in this tolerant epoch. On the other hand, a hundred years ago the Armada was barely remembered, and all the enthusiasm of which statesman and citizen were capable was concentrated on the events which had established the sovereignty of Parliament.

The reason for this change of sentiment probably is that in 1788 the position of the House of Commons was still unstable—only twelve years earlier the Duke of Richmond writes to Burke that he believes England is on the verge of despotism, and therefore he is going to try to secure a peerage for himself in France—and this very instability brought home to men's minds the importance of the victory won at the Revolution. Now that we have become fully accustomed to the absolute pre-eminence in power of the Lower House, we are less interested in celebrating the birth of this supremacy than in devising means for turning it to good use.

But perhaps this is paying too great a compliment to ourselves, as compared with our ancestors, for in the course of this article it will be seen that the men who in 1788 eat and danced, and preached and prayed, roasted oxen and let off fireworks, in honour of the landing of William of Orange, had also in their minds the future uses to which parliamentary power might be put. The year was, in fact, in many ways a remarkable one. During the latter half of last century philanthropic and humanitarian ideas had made enormous progress in

England, as elsewhere, and the influence of these ideas bore fruit in 1788, in Pitt's motion for the regulation of the slave trade, and in the impeachment of Warren Hastings. The object of this article is to remind Englishmen of to-day of the movements which engaged the attention of our ancestors a hundred years ago, and of the sentiments, real or superficial, which actuated them in celebrating the first centenary of the "Glorious Revolution."

The key-note of the centenary celebration is struck in a poem which appears in the *Morning Post* of Nov. 5, "An Ode in Commemoration of the Glorious Revolution of 1688, by W. Mason, M.A." It is much too long to quote at full length, and the personal pronouns are so involved that it is rather difficult always to make out who the *She* is who takes such a prominent part in the poem. The following excerpts are about the least bald stanzas in the bulky original, and have at any rate this advantage over the complete poem, that by reading these only it is possible, with a comparatively slight mental effort, to arrive at a connected meaning.

"Was there an angel in the sky,
That glowed not with celestial joy,
When Freedom in her native charms,
Descended from her throne of light?

Since then triumphant on the car of Time
Twice fifty years in gradual train have rolled,
And seen the Goddess from her sphere sublime
The sacred page unfold,
Inscribed by Hers and Nassau's hands,
On which the hallowed charter stands
That bids Britannia's sons be free.

Again she comes to magnify her reign,
And make the world her own.
Her fire e'en France presumes to feel
And half unsheaths the patriot steel.

Hark how from either India's sultry bound,
From regions girded by the burning zone,
Her all attentive ear with sigh profound,
Has heard the captive's moan.

Tell them, they vainly grace, with festive joy,
The day that freed them from oppression's rod,
At slavery's mart who barter and who buy
The image of their God.

But peace!—their conscience feels the wrong;
From Britain's congregated tongue,
Repentant breaks the choral lay,
'Not unto us, indulgent Heaven,
In partial streams be freedom given,
But pour her treasures wide and guard with legal sway.'

About the literary merit of this composition the less said the better, but the few stanzas here resuscitated are very useful as giving in a

compact form the principal points involved in the celebration of the Revolution. The "hallowed charter" is of course the Bill of Rights—the bargain between the Prince of Orange and the People of England, by which the one party obtained the crown of Great Britain, and the other constitutional government. The allusion to the premonitory rumblings of the French Revolution is enlivened by the unfortunate word "presumes." Englishmen habitually adopt an air of confident superiority to the rest of the world whenever the subject of self-government is mentioned, but we hardly go so far—in prose—as to hint that it is presumption for a Frenchman even to desire the abolition of tyranny.

The next verse is much more happy. The event of the year, in connection with the East Indies, was the commencement of the trial of Warren Hastings. This remarkable man, the first Governor-General of India, and next perhaps to Clive the principal founder of our Eastern Empire, had recently returned home, proud of the conquests which his skill in warfare and diplomacy had won for England; and all the more proud because they had been won in spite of the factious opposition of his own council in India, and the narrow greed of his directors at home. The warmth of his first reception only confirmed his very natural belief that he would receive full recompense in honour for the material advantages which his skill and energy had brought to his country; but the other side of the picture was all too soon disclosed. New territory had been conquered, increased revenues had been acquired, the British power had been firmly established. But how? The animosity of Philip Francis, aided by the fierce eloquence of Burke and Sheridan, laid bare the disgraceful story. To gain his ends Hastings had not shrunk from employing, as it suited him, the most brutal violence or the meanest treachery. Prisoners in the custody of British officers had been subjected to the refinements of native torture; princes who had trusted in British honour had been ruthlessly robbed.

As these terrible charges were one by one brought to light in successive motions in the House of Commons, the indignation of the country at the foul disgrace to the British name was at length aroused. By a large majority the House decided on the impeachment of Hastings, and early in 1788 the trial was opened in Westminster Hall, before the full House of Lords sitting amid all the pageantry that mediævalism could remember or the importance of the man and of the matter suggest. Crowds flocked daily to Westminster Hall to listen to the brilliant eloquence of the managers of the indictment, and to watch the strange spectacle of the great lever of English liberties—the right of impeachment by the Commons—being applied to redress the wrongs of Hindoos and Mussulmans living six thousand miles from England's shores.

But it was not only towards the East that the widening sympathies of the English people reached out; they embraced also the Indies of the West, and the sufferings of the plantation slaves and the horrors of the Middle Passage kindled a fire of generous emotion and stern resolve that spread throughout the whole of the United Kingdom. One of the events which most contributed towards forming the determination of Englishmen to put down the slave trade, was the decision in the celebrated case of the slave, James Somerset. This man, who had been brought to England by his master from the West Indies as a body servant, escaped while in London, was recaptured, and confined in a ship in the Thames to await reshipment to Jamaica. A writ of Habeas Corpus was moved for by his friends, and, after an elaborate hearing in the Court of King's Bench, Chief Justice Mansfield reluctantly decided; that considerations of the vested interests involved could not override the law of the land; that in England, since the extinction of villeinage, the law had recognized no form of slavery; and that therefore the man Somerset must be discharged.

This was in 1772, and the immediate consequences of the decision were, first, the breakdown of the common practice of buying and selling negro slaves in *England* for shipment to the plantations; secondly, the initiation of an organized movement for the entire abolition of the slave trade. It was against the trade in slaves rather than against the institution of slavery that the strength of the movement was directed. The trade was undoubtedly the greater evil, and many of the most ardent agitators for its suppression were reluctant to abolish altogether the institution of slavery, which then seemed absolutely essential to the continuance of the sugar industry, and which might, at any rate in theory, be worked without disregarding the primary dictates of humanity. So universal indeed was the practice of slaveholding, that even missionary societies possessed slaves, and as late as 1783 the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel deliberately refused to give Christian instruction to the slaves on their estate in Barbadoes on the plea that it might encourage them to revolt.

This striking instance shows how small a support would have been accorded to proposals for a complete abolition of slavery. But about the iniquity and cruelty of the trade in slaves there could be no question. Free men living in comfort and plenty were violently taken from their homes, packed in layers under the decks of a ship, carried thus for weeks in the tropical seas, and then sold to perpetual servitude. If they fell sick on the voyage, they were thrown overboard; if they pined for want of exercise, they were brought up on deck and made to dance under the stimulus of the whip. Every year a hundred thousand human beings made this passage from Africa to the West Indies. Why should the planters economize

their old slaves when there was this plentiful supply of fresh material? Work them till they drop, cut down their rations to a minimum, and if they are troublesome flog them to death. But if, said the reformers, we can stop the importations from Africa, then the planters must rely on the natural increase among the already existing slave population, and self-interest will compel greater humanity.

These arguments are still interesting as showing the tentative gradual way in which all great reforms must proceed. But the feature of the movement which more specially throws light on the character of the time, is the fact that the anti-slave trade movement depended solely on humanitarian feelings, and that these feelings had gained such strength within two generations as to completely reverse the average opinion of Englishmen. In 1713 our statesmen, in negotiating the Treaty of Utrecht, had insisted that England should acquire the monopoly of the slave trade. Of all the provisions of the Treaty this was apparently the only one which secured the popular enthusiasm of the nation. During the succeeding seventy years, England reaped out of this clause a rich harvest; her ships and sailors were busily employed, and it was estimated that Liverpool netted a quarter of a million sterling out of the trade. And yet in 1788 the Prime Minister of England rose in his place in the House of Commons, and gave notice of a motion for a temporary Regulating Act, and for a Commission to consider whether the trade could not be completely suppressed.

After this rather lengthy commentary on Mr. Mason's poem, let us pass on to some of the reports of the gatherings which took place in celebration of the centenary of the Revolution. In the *Morning Post* of Nov. 6, is a report of a meeting of the Constitutional Club, prefaced by the following note:—

"The institution of the Constitutional Club being for the express purpose of maintaining the Rights of the People, and the Freedom of Election, the celebration of the Centenary of the Revolution was an opportunity eagerly seized upon by the members of this Society to show their respect and gratitude to the memory of the immortal KING WILLIAM, to whom this country is indebted for its Liberties and Independence."

From the report which follows we learn that the members attended Divine service at *St. Margaret's Church*, Westminster, in the morning, and early in the evening TWELVE HUNDRED of them met for dinner at Willis's Rooms. Lord Hood was in the chair, and the Marquis of Graham, Lord Robert Fitzgerald, &c. &c., acted as stewards, and "with the greatest politeness attended at the different tables and saw that the company were properly attended to and well accommodated." The first toast given by the noble chairman was—The Rights of the People; this was followed by a toast to the memory of King William, and by the usual loyal toasts to the reigning Sovereign and his family. King George was at the time suffering

from one of the most serious of his attacks of madness, and respectful allusions were made to his misfortune. The following quotation from the *Morning Post* of Nov. 8 shows, however, that his Majesty did not receive the same attention at all the commemoration banquets:—

"At the Revolution Society, at the Constitutional Club, and in short at every assembly of the sort of which we have had any account, *the Whig Club excepted*, his Majesty's health was cheerfully and cordially drank. And what is the inference to be drawn from such a conduct in the Whig Club? Why this: They are the only set of men who on this joyful occasion suffered factious and party motives to get the better of them so far as to treat with silent neglect—perhaps contempt—one branch of that glorious Constitution which the Revolution served to procure for this country. The Whigs of 1688 thought a Constitution composed of King, Lords, and Commons that for which they were bound to shed their blood, but the *nominal* Whigs of 1788 think Lords and Commons quite enough—nay, they would be content to see even the Lords discarded—and in this case the nation would be *happily* freed from the burden of a Parliament, while the business of the nation would be settled with great *conviviality* and *honesty* by the Whig Club assembled at the Crown and Anchor, or at Brookes's, as might be found convenient."

Among the banquets which took place on this occasion was a large dinner at the London Tavern, presided over by Lord Stanhope, and the toasts which were drunk at it give us a curious idea of the views of our ancestors a century ago. There is not room here to quote them all, but the following rather full selection will sufficiently indicate their general character:—

1. The Majesty of the People; 2. The Glorious Revolution and Immortal Memory of our great deliverer, King William the Third; 3. The King and the Royal Family; 6. The Immortal Memory of Alfred the Great, and may all the kings of the earth imitate his example; 7. May the principles of Magna Charta, of the Habeas Corpus Act, and of the Incomparable Bill of Rights be deeply engraved for ever on every British breast; 9. The cause of Liberty throughout the Globe; 10. May the example of one Revolution prevent the necessity of another; 14. Success to that Government that prefers armed Citizens to armed Slaves; 15. Mr. Howard and the Friends of Humanity throughout the Globe; 17. The Immortal Memory of Hampden, Pym, Russel, and Sydney; 19. May the dawn of Liberty on the Continent be soon succeeded by the bright Sunshine of personal and mental freedom; 21. Volunteer Crews and no Pressgangs; 22. The Tars of Old England; 23. A speedy restoration of the rights of the People to a fair and equal representation in Parliament; 24. A total abolition of the Slave Trade; 25. A Revision of the Code of Criminal Laws; 26. When Kings lose their utility, may the People find their dignity.

Most of the allusions in these toasts are sufficiently obvious. In the year 1788 the philanthropic labours of John Howard for the

reformation of English prisons were drawing to a close. He commenced his mission in 1773, and his reports on the condition of gaols all over England were rapidly successful in securing remedial measures from Parliament. Probably, in fact, few reformers have seen success so soon reward their efforts, but few have dealt with such terrible evils. In many gaols visited by Howard the prisoners had no allowance of food, but subsisted on the doles dropped into their hands by charitable persons as they passed their barred cages. Convicts of both sexes and of every age were often crowded together in subterranean cells, unlighted, unwarmed, undrained. The air was foul with filthy exhalations, loathsome diseases of the skin were almost universal, and gaol fever every year carried off more victims even than the gallows.

And the gallows then was seldom idle. Reformers might well toast a revision of the code of criminal laws. The criminal laws of England were a disgrace to Europe; they were an ill-digested mass of antiquated custom, overlaid with piles of disconnected, badly-drawn statutes. The only common characteristic of the whole code was its sanguinary fierceness. More than one hundred and fifty offences were punishable by death, and though injured persons constantly refused to prosecute offenders, witnesses to appear, and juries to convict, and though of those convicted about half were pardoned by the Crown, still the number of men and women who every year went to the gallows was enormous. At the same time, the provisions of the law were so utterly haphazard, that it was often pure chance whether a criminal would turn out to be guilty of a capital offence or merely of a misdemeanour.

Another serious evil from which England was then suffering was the system of impressment for the navy. This arbitrary interference with private liberty was based on long-continued custom, and Lord Mansfield, when appealed to, declared that its legality could not be disputed. Approaching the question from the other side, the side of utility, Lord Chatham had stated his belief that without the press-gang it would be impossible to maintain the navy. But in spite of these dicta the humanitarian feeling of England was rising strong against the continuance of this cruel tyranny.

As another of the above quoted toasts shows, the desire for Parliamentary reform was also one of the prominent impulses of the time. The question had been brought before Parliament in 1780 by the Duke of Richmond, who proposed universal suffrage and annual Parliaments, and again by Pitt, in a much more moderate form, in 1784. It is probable that this question, along with many other important political and social questions, would soon have been settled but for the outbreak of the French Revolution. This event, which was partially anticipated by the end of 1788, did perhaps as much harm in England as it did good in France. There, reforms

for which the country had been waiting for centuries, were carried through with a rush ; but this very rush frightened the reformers of England, and questions already ripe for solution were postponed for a quarter of a century.

To return to the lighter side of the gatherings in November 1788, and to pass from the metropolis to the country, we learn from the daily papers that at Reigate, in Surrey, "the Jubilee of the Glorious Revolution was celebrated with uncommon felicity and joy. The morning opened with the musick of the steeple. About three o'clock the gentlemen of that town and neighbourhood, among whom were several Freemasons, assembled at the Swan Inn, where a very elegant dinner was provided for them. In the evening a bonfire was made, barrels of beer were given to the populace, and the day concluded with every demonstration of hilarity and mirth."

This report appears in the *Morning Chronicle* of Nov. 7, which is perhaps as prompt as could be expected ; but apparently editors were less anxious to have their news smoking hot in 1788 than they are in 1888, for the bulk of reports of celebrations in various towns on the 5th, do not appear in the London newspapers till the 13th and 14th of the month. A few of these reports may be quoted.

At Birmingham "the day was ushered in by ringing of bells, and at three o'clock a large assembly sat down to dinner at the hotel." The inhabitants of the Midland metropolis would probably be puzzled to say which was *the* hotel now in Birmingham. "The majority of the company was dressed in blue coats with orange capes, having on beautiful emblematical buttons manufactured by ingenious gentlemen of the town. They likewise wore, pendant on an orange ribbon, elegant silver medals, which were struck upon the occasion. Of these medals a quantity, of a different metal, were distributed among the populace." After dark the streets and principal buildings were illuminated, and transparencies and ornamental lights were shown from the hotel. The next night there was a ball, also at the hotel, at which ladies as well as gentlemen wore orange and blue.

At Sheffield most of the gentlemen wore blue coats with orange capes, and buttons on which was struck the head of William III.

At Leeds the celebration of the Revolution Jubilee was attended with every demonstration of joy and gratitude. "The ball at our Assembly Rooms on Tuesday evening, was a very brilliant one ; near three hundred ladies and gentlemen being present."

At York "the Corporation went in procession to the Cathedral in their formalities, preceded by the City band, and a sermon applicable to the occasion was delivered. Several select parties dined together in the city, which was elegantly illuminated. The evening closed with a crowded ball, and ale was liberally distributed in the streets."

At Hull "the societies in the town endeavoured to outvie one

another in displaying their new colours with various kinds of inscriptions. The garrison guns were fired, and the ships in the docks and harbour had all their colours flying."

At Selby an ox was roasted whole, and distributed to the populace at the Market Cross, with a large quantity of ale.

At Pocklington, Sir Joseph Pennington, "on the above joyful occasion, gave great plenty of beef, ham, &c., to his tenants."

The Mayor and Corporation of Gloucester went in procession to the Cathedral, and "heard an excellent discourse from the Dean."

Similarly at Hereford, the Mayor and Corporation, followed by the City companies with their colours, attended Divine service at the Cathedral. Afterwards "an elegant dinner was provided by the Revolution Society at the Swan and Falcon, at which were present the Lord Bishop of Hereford, Lord Bateman, Lord Malden, Sir George Cornwall, and others to the number of 150."

At Richmond, in Yorkshire, they celebrated the day with ringing of bells and a large bonfire in the market-place.

At Derby, John Crompton, Esq., "gave a fat ox and ten fat sheep, which were roasted whole in different parts of the town and given to the populace."

Plymouth distinguished itself by uniting in one celebration the two events of the year '88—the Armada and the Revolution. Salutes were fired from the citadel and from the fleet, dinners eaten, toasts drunk, and the evening wound up with dancing and fireworks.

In Scotland the celebrations were slightly more solemn, as might be expected. At Edinburgh "the fifth instant was observed as a day of thanksgiving. A number of excellent sermons were preached at the various churches, in which the rise, progress, motives, and joyful effects of the Revolution that followed, were pointed out in a most masterly and patriotic manner." At Glasgow, in obedience to an order of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, business was suspended during the day, and there was feasting in the evening.

But the most dramatic celebration took place in Derbyshire, at the towns of Whittington and Chesterfield, not far from the seat of the Cavendish family. At both towns there were public dinners presided over by descendants of the great Whig families, who had been mainly instrumental in bringing about the Revolution. There were also processions with bands and flags and symbolic figures, and Chesterfield wound up the day with a grand ball for the county gentry, and fireworks and free liquor for the general populace. Nor was the celebration a mere party glorification got up by the Whig nobility. The writer of the report in the *Gentleman's Magazine* concludes with the remark: "It was not the least pleasing circumstance attending this meeting that all party distinctions were for-

gotten. Persons of all ranks and denominations wore orange and blue in memory of our glorious Deliverer. And the most respectable Roman Catholic families, satisfied with the mild toleration of Government in the exercise of their religion, vied in their endeavours to show how just a sense they had of the value of CIVIL LIBERTY."

This last sentence contains the justification for our continuing to give national honour to the event which we used proudly to call Our Glorious Revolution, until the broader meaning of the word was drowned in blood on the Place de la Republique. As the *Gentleman's Magazine* rightly says, the real triumph of the Revolution was the attainment of civil liberty. Religious questions were undoubtedly involved, and, probably, without their presence there would not have been sufficient motive power to force on the crisis. But once the victory was completely gained, the spirit of toleration began to make sure progress, and to lead the way to religious freedom.

For the victory gained in 1688 was infinitely more than a mere change of king, or change of dynasty: it was a change of ideas. Under the Stuarts, King and Church had done their utmost to make the nation accept the utterly un-English doctrine that a KING rules by right divine. Time-serving judges had disregarded statute and precedent in order to uphold on all possible occasions, and extend in all possible ways, the power of the Royal Prerogative. Ecclesiasticism in the pulpit and corruption on the bench, were strangling out of existence the liberties inherent in our Constitution. Under the two last Stuarts, the remembrance of the horrors of the late Rebellion made men shrink from incurring the responsibilities of a new one, and left room for the insidious advances of the power of the Crown. A few more years of this *régime* and the English people might have sunk in submission to an absolute monarch.

But the Revolution did more than sweep away the whole card-house of sophisms about right divine; it did more than save our old liberties: it gave us new ones. With the declaration of the Convention that the throne of England was vacant, the Government of our country ceased to be personal and became parliamentary. The body that could dismiss one Sovereign and hold the Crown in abeyance till it had elected another, had obviously power enough to call Ministers to account and to settle any question it chose to make its own. It is from the landing of William of Orange that dates the transference of the real power in the State from the Crown to the Commons. Questions of detail might still remain unsettled and give rise to fresh conflict, but the main point was determined beyond hope of revision, that in all matters of government, small or great, the *final* authority lies with the House of Commons.

THE WAKING DREAMS OF TWO LORD CHANCELLORS.

THE realm of imagination has always had a wonderful fascination for man. Spenser, who himself revelled in it, calls it "the world's sweet inn from care and wearysome turmoil;" and it has formed the delight of many, when with weary hearts they realized the unsatisfactoriness of their surroundings, and felt that this life is not what it ought to be, or even as it might be. Not only the foolish ones of this earth have given free scope to their imaginations, and amused themselves with building castles in the air, with fancying an ideal state, where every wish, whether for good or evil, will be fulfilled; but some of the very wisest have been amongst the dreamers. Solon was said to have written in his last days of a perfect island, and Plato also had some such ideal paradise; but it is only with two of our own countrymen that we mean to deal at present.

In the sixteenth, and again in the seventeenth century, we find one of the greatest men of each era choosing this dream of perfection as an amusement for the leisure they could snatch from their other weighty employments. Both of them Lord Chancellors of England, favourites for a time with their respective sovereigns, eminent lawyers, encouragers of learning, authors of enduring fame, and living, each of them, in a great epoch of their country's history, their fancy seems to have strayed to the same subject for a pastime, the one as a relaxation in the midst of his multifarious business, the other as a solace in his enforced retirement and old age.

Perhaps the different seasons of life at which they wrote their works may partly account for the variance in the works themselves; it was natural that a young man should dream more of social reforms, an older one of scientific discoveries. Then the different epochs in which they lived had also their effect. More was still to some extent under the influence of the schoolmen, who despised all scientific and mechanical effort for the relief of mankind, believing, as Seneca expressed it, that "the invention of such things is drudgery for the lowest slaves; philosophy lies deeper; it is not her office to teach men how to use their hands, the object of her lessons is to form the soul." Lord Bacon was completely emancipated from that idea, and the purpose of philosophy, in his opinion, was the relief of man's

estate. But the great dissimilitude in their nature must still more be taken into account. Both were of mild temper and courteous manner ; More with his simple straightforwardness, his capacity for steadfast friendship, his high moral and religious principles, revealing a nature likely to believe that the noblest study of mankind is man, and that goodness and love are of all things the most precious, contrasts forcibly with what we know of the other Lord Chancellor. And as the men agree in some points and differ in others, so with their books. Each sketches a pure, good people, discovered living on an island hitherto unknown ; but while the one discourses fully on the advancement shown in social and political matters, the other confines himself almost completely to the scientific wonders of the House of Solamona. Probably the idea of the Utopia was suggested to Sir Thomas More by the Critias of Plato ; but at this time the whole civilized world was being roused by strange stories of new lands and new people.

Only a few years before he wrote his famous work, all Europe had been astonished by the wonderful discoveries of Columbus beyond the Atlantic wave. The popular fancy had been caught by the rumours of the fabulous wealth and the strange people found on those shores, and the keen interest was heightened by the mystery and secrecy maintained by the Spaniards over the announcement of the New World. A traveller's tale, therefore, fell on willing ears, and Sir Thomas More adopted this pleasing guise to enable him to set forth his opinions on subjects that it would have been dangerous for him to have discussed openly. While writing for a wise purpose, he at the same time derived great pleasure from his fancy. In a letter to Erasmus in 1517, a year after the publication of his work, he tells him, "That he is in the clouds with the dream of the Government to be offered him by his Utopians, fancies himself a grand potentate with a crown and a Franciscan cloak, followed by a grand procession of the Amauri. Should it please heaven to exalt him to this high dignity, where he will be too high to think of common acquaintances, he will still keep a corner in his heart for Erasmus and Tunstal, and should they pay him a visit to Utopia, he will make all his subjects honour them as is befitting the friends of majesty. The morn has dawned and dispelled his dream, and stripped off his royalty, plunging him down into his old mill round at the Court."

If the author enjoyed his book, the readers were also enchanted with it, one calling it "a most pleasant, fruitfull, and wittie worke ;" and Erasmus, in another letter, tells of a burgomaster at Antwerp being so pleased with it, that he knew it all by heart ; and who can wonder at it, when the very name of the book has passed into the English language as a synonym for an earthly paradise.

In our days Communists are looked for from amongst the class that

have nothing to lose but everything to gain, if their creed is carried into effect; but here is the Lord Chancellor of one of England's most luxurious kings, placing his ideal paradise in an island where everything was held in common, where gold and silver were only used for contemptuous purposes, where all were dressed alike in sober garments, and where jewels were worn by children only. At a time when the households of the rich were filled with retainers, he pictures a community where the malefactors were the only bondmen, where all were on a perfect equality, age and experience being the sole superiority admitted; where there were no servants, the young waited on the old, the children on their parents. But strange as these sentiments might sound in the ears of More's contemporaries, the time had come when there was to be a breaking up of old things, an awakening from a long sleep, a transition from the narrowness of the Middle Ages to the breadth of modern times: truly a new birth. Men began to think for themselves, and to express their thoughts, though still often at the risk of their lives. Colet dared to denounce the war King Henry had entered on in strong terms, thundering from St. Paul's that, "an unjust peace is better than the justest war;" and though belief in the divine right of kings lasted another century with the populace, Erasmus was bold enough to say that, "Kings who are scarcely men, are called 'divine;' they are 'invincible,' though they fly from every battlefield; 'serene,' though they turn the world upside down in a storm of war; 'illustrious,' though they grovel in ignorance of all that is noble; 'Catholic,' though they follow anything rather than Christ."

So with Sir Thomas More, though his dear friend Erasmus exclaimed with reference to him: "When did Nature mould a temper more gentle, endearing, and happy, than the temper of Thomas More!" yet beneath that sunny temperament lay an indomitable nature, not to be bent out of its course, or turned aside from his fixed principles, but able to carry even to death the motto he chose when he took office: "First look to God, and after God, to the King."

More was the first to turn from the purely religious and intellectual changes that had been made, and to think of the social reforms needed; and it is a wonderful cry for the poor that he sends up at a time when theirs "was a life so wretched that even a beast's life seems enviable." Scarcely a change made in these latter times but he shadows forth the need for it and suggests what it ought to be.

The evils of a large standing army he inveighs against, but there is another grievance which he considers "is proper and peculiar to Englishmen alone: that one covetous and insatiable cormorant and very plague of his native country may compass about and inclose many acres of ground together with one pale or hedge, and the husband-

man be thrust out of their own." "Away they trudge I say out of their known and accustomed houses, finding no place to rest in."

The true end of punishment he shows ought to be reformation, or, as he puts it, "the destruction of vices and saving of men," a doctrine that has only now gained ground; but, as he says, "it is not possible for all things to be well unless all men were good. Which I think will not be yet these good many years." The promoters of the Channel tunnel would not have found favour in his sight, as he evidently thought an island the preferable shape for an impregnable kingdom, and tells how the king caused the sea to flow round about the land in Utopia; but "woman's rights" and the "temperance question" might have found in him an able supporter, for "the good wife" was not only joined with the "good man" in the rule of the household, and in all the studies of his spare hours, but on the battle-field was encouraged to "stand every one by her own husband's side;" and corn was sown only for bread, and "Oh holy Commonwealth and of Christians to be followed, there be neither wine taverns nor ale houses."

An American humorist says the ancients have stolen all our modern ideas, and here we find many things that the moderns claim as their own, from the "nine hour's movement," the care for preventing infection, sanitary arrangements, &c., down to the hatching of chickens by a hibernating machine.

But of all remarkable things in Utopia, More's moderate and liberal views in respect to religion are the most remarkable. "First of all, he (the king) made a decree that it should be lawful for every man to favour and follow what religion he would." "That no man should be blamed for reasoning in the maintenance of his religion," but if he could not by fair and gentle speech induce them unto his opinion "yet he should use no kind of violence and refrain from displeasing and tedious words," on pain of banishment or bondage. He "gave to every man free liberty and choice to believe what he would." "Saving that he earnestly and straitly charged them, that no man should conceive so vile and base an opinion of the dignity of man's nature as to think that the souls do die and perish with the body, or that the world runneth at all adventures governed by no divine providence. Him that is of a contrary opinion, they count not in the number of men, much less in the number of their citizens, whose laws and ordinances if it were not for fear he would do nothing at all esteem." "Wherefore he that is thus minded is deprived of all honours, excluded from all common administrations in the weal public. Howbeit they put him to no punishment, because they be persuaded that it is in no man's power to believe what he list."

What a wonderful spirit of liberality and a clearness of judgment at such a time, when the strife was only commencing between the Papacy and the Reformation, when religious toleration seemed a

thing unknown, and persecution was considered not only right but virtuous by both parties. Well might he finish by saying that "many things be in the Utopian weal public which in our cities I may rather wish for than hope after."

If Lord Bacon had not left his New Atlantis unfinished, he also might have given us in it his ideas of perfection in government ; but naturally the part came first in which his heart was most interested. One thing we may assume, that it would not have been so ascetic as that of Utopia ; for gold, jewels, and fine raiment are freely used among the inhabitants of New Atlantis, and drink of three sorts are described, all wholesome and good. The religion of the people is dealt with and in a very fine spirit, but the motive for the book was the same as he gives for the building of Solamona's house : "The end of our foundation is the knowledge of causes and secret motions of things, and the enlarging of the bounds of human empire to the effecting of all things possible."

As in More's time the nation was throwing off the trammels of monastic thought, now in the age when Bacon lived, another great change was taking place in the public mind. The world had become tired of the school philosophy, and science, after a sleep of nearly two thousand years, was again beginning to ask her daring questions. In the century that elapsed between the issue of the two books, Copernicus had lived and enunciated his scheme of the solar system ; and Bruno had suffered unto death for believing that Matter was the universal mother. And the New Atlantis was sent forth in the midst of the vain struggle of Galileo with the Inquisition. There is nothing wild or improbable in this dream of science which he unfolds, nothing but what he hoped would be, when the inductive philosophy had done its work ; and although to the men of his time it must have read like a fairy tale, yet now many of the prodigies have been accomplished, and many more with time and patience may be.

Holding in perfect control his powerful imagination, he yet gave it free scope, and "the Interpreters of Nature" in the New Atlantis are represented as far in advance of our modern scientists. The possibility of life, springing from earth, air, and putrefaction, without antecedent life, had been by them demonstrated, and they could develop such into "perfect creatures like beasts or birds." Neither did they this "by chance, but knew before hand of what matter and commixture, what kind of those creatures will arise."

Parks and enclosures had they, of all sorts of beasts and birds for experimenting on, by medicines, poisons, or vivisection, that thereby they may "take light of what may be wrought upon the body of man." The Eiffel Tower sinks into insignificance beside their towers of half a mile in height, "set on hills so that the vantage in the highest of them is three miles at least ;" and surely they

anticipate the telephone, when they speak of "certain helps, which set to the ear do further the hearing greatly," "having also means to convey sounds in trunks and pipes, in strange lines and distances." But the list of wonders is too long to repeat, the flying machines, the engines of war, the wild fires burning in water and unquenchable, the curious clocks, the perpetual motions, are only a very few of the marvels of the House of Solamona.

The dream of science is as wonderful as the social dream, and what a paradise in every way the junction of the two ideal commonwealths would be. Surely we are drawing nearer to its accomplishment. Could More see all the social benefits won for the poor, and Bacon know the results that have flowed from the inductive method of reasoning, they would each think the Utopia and New Atlantis would soon be realized here below.

Still it is almost appalling to consider what yet remains to be done, and all the influences of educated intelligence are needed to keep before the world an ideal standard of excellence.

"This fine old world of ours is but a child,
Yet in the go-cart, Patience; Give it time
To learn its limbs; There is a Hand that guides."

POLITICAL TRIALS IN SCOTLAND : A PARALLEL—1793 and 1888.

By his appeal to the Court of Session in Edinburgh, in preference to an English Court and an English jury, and even the Commission of Judges provided for him by his political opponents, Mr. Parnell gains several important advantages. He secures, for example, a legal and judicial adjustment of the case to be tried, and the presentation to the jury of a definite issue in the form of probably not more than two or three questions to be answered according to the evidence submitted. To simplicity of procedure has to be added the further attraction of the prospect of a comparatively early decision, for a jury trial in Scotland cannot be indefinitely prolonged, and the arrangement by which a simple majority may determine the verdict prevents the possibility of the proceedings being rendered abortive on account of disagreement among the jury. Again, the reference to a tribunal whose authority and independence are guaranteed by the treaty of Union between England and Scotland, and which is known to be jealous of the respect due to it as a Court of Law, at once compelled the *Times* to abstain from a repetition of the charges which for upwards of a year it had published almost daily against Mr. Parnell and his friends. The case is now *sub judice*, and any reckless discussion of the merits by either of the parties outside of the Court might be punished as an act of contempt.

Doubtless, however, a consciousness of the political sympathy of Scotchmen with him as the Home Rule leader is the chief explanation of Mr. Parnell's selection of the Court of Session. He believes he is less likely to be made the victim of national or party prejudice by a Scotch than by an English jury. Mr. Parnell's preference in this respect is easily accounted for by the unmistakable manifestations made north of the Tweed of popular distrust and resentment of the Coercionist policy of the anti-Home Rulers. But why should a Coercionist policy be more objectionable to Scotchmen than to other subjects of her Majesty? An answer is to be found to some extent, at least, in the political history and experience of the country. Scotchmen themselves have had a taste of Coercion. The political persecution now being so ruthlessly carried on in Ireland under the direction of Mr. A. J. Balfour presents not a few points of resemblance to the political inquisition and the State trials conducted in Scotland

near the close of the last century, with a view of suppressing the Reform agitation promoted by the Friends of the People. In one respect this similarity suggests most painful reflections. It is pitiful that Ireland, as a part of the British Empire, should be found nearly a hundred years behind Scotland in the struggle for political emancipation. But in other respects the similarity is suggestive of hope for the cause of freedom in Ireland, in the severe crisis through which the country is just passing. For in the first place the flagrant inequality which is revealed is itself strongly condemnatory of the system of government under which Ireland has been held back. In the next place, similarity of experience awakens a sense of a certain kinship of feeling. Persecution never achieves its purpose. On the contrary, it helps and hastens the cause it seeks unjustly and with the strong arm to put down. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church. The smoke of the fires lit under the men who in Reformation days refused to acknowledge the supremacy of Rome infected all the spectators and established the Protestant faith. The "Killing Time," with its resolute government in the interests of Episcopacy, made Scotland unconquerably Presbyterian. Similarly, the persecution of the Friends of the People developed the national heroism and patriotism and helped to make Scotland Liberal. And the memory of that persecution is still a living political force in Scotland. There are men yet living whose fathers suffered in it; and, imitating the close self-repression and reserve maintained by their ancestors because of the terrible penalties to which association with the proclaimed political societies exposed them, through the force of the old habit, lapse into silence or display wariness of speech when inquiry is suddenly made at them regarding the marked men or "suspects" of those bad days, the political literature which was proscribed but yet extensively read in spite of the perils of imprisonment and banishment, or the nature of the meetings which were prohibited as agencies of sedition and revolutionary agitation. There are many families and communities, especially in the old weaving districts, in which connection with the Friends, whether in unflinching agitation or in heroic suffering, is cherished as an inspiring political heritage, and transmitted from generation to generation as a proud and honourable distinction. This influence not merely quickens and sustains Liberal belief in Scotland; it likewise predisposes Liberal Scotchmen to regard the Irish Nationalists with something like brotherly sympathy, and explains the remarkable strength of the political party in Scotland that favours Home Rule for Ireland and hates and distrusts Mr. Balfour's coercion as a continuance in another field of the equally pitiless and blundering tyranny of the Dundases in Scotland.

The societies formed in Scotland by the Friends of the People were purely political organizations. They were mainly composed of strongly religious men, who, taking their politics from the Bible,

believed in equality before the law as a divine right. Recognizing the universal brotherhood of the race, they regarded war as sinful, as well as nationally burdensome, and a fruitful source of mischief and misery. They had no sympathy with the military policy which sought to make Britain the arbiter of the destinies of Europe, and constantly embroiled her in Continental campaigns, and more especially in hostility to France. They welcomed the French Revolution as the dawn of a new era of civil freedom and social progress; but as the eventful years rolled past, they regarded the excesses committed in the name of the French Republic with horror and dismay. They endeavoured to keep their own movement in strict conformity with constitutional order. They repudiated revolutionary designs. They disapproved of regicide; and, in conjunction with their English allies, they used what influence they possessed with the French Republican party to save King Louis from the scaffold—their leader, Thomas Muir, younger, of Huntershill, having been sent specially to Paris to advise the chiefs of the Revolution to avoid the blunder and crime of killing the king or of pursuing a course of revengeful retaliation. For themselves they declared they would be contented with a reform of the constitution, and therefore they discouraged revolution, or the use of armed force. They conspired neither against the king, nor the aristocracy, nor the church. All they wanted was the political emancipation of the people. The leading points of their charter were universal suffrage and annual parliaments. At this time the Scottish people had no political representation in the Imperial Parliament, and no voice in the management of their affairs. Forty-five gentlemen, indeed, sat at Westminster as Scotch representatives, but thirty of them, who were county members, were elected by about a thousand individuals, while the electing constituency for the fifteen burgh members consisted of only sixty-five individuals, themselves chosen by the close and rotten municipal corporations. The entire government, local and national, was in the hands of an ignorant and heartless oligarchy. The Friends of the People wished to change this form of government, which they felt to be tyrannical and extravagant, as well as unjust and contrary alike to Scripture and reason. They believed that if the control of the administration were transferred from the few to the many, the government would become a blessing instead of a scourge. But they sought to gain their ends by peaceful means. Feeling that knowledge was power, they invoked the aid of the printing-press. They published a political journal, named *The Patriot*, for the purpose of disseminating their opinions; and they encouraged each other, and all whom, in their several districts, they desired to convert to their side, to read diligently political works. They held meetings, too, in connection with their propagandism, and the proceedings were almost invariably begun and closed with prayer. Yet they were regarded and treated as disloyal and seditious persons, as wicked revolutionaries

whom the interests of law and order required to be punished with the utmost severity. And the agents of law and order executed their duty and their instructions with merciless vigour and rigour. The meetings of the Friends were prohibited and their literature was denounced as political poison. An odious system of espionage was instituted in every community. Pious elders in the Secession Churches were seized and cast into prison on the reports of informers that they had attended the interdicted meetings or had been privy to the circulation of the condemned *Patriot*. Many families, among whom the fear of God was stronger than the fear of man, whose heads were honoured and venerated members of society, and whose sons were strong and chivalrous upholders of the cause of freedom as well as of morality, were dispersed as in the days of the Covenanters. All political freedom was suppressed. Men could not meet in groups of two or three on the public street without bringing on themselves the suspicion and the vengeance of the officers of law and order. They could not even whisper their thoughts to each other in the privacy of home and feel themselves safe. Imprisonment and transportation were the scorpion whips freely employed by the heart-hardened agents of the tyrannical Government. Yet the spirit of freedom was not killed. After a few years the right of public meeting was recovered, the agitation for reform was renewed with increased vigour, and since 1832 the sons and the grandsons of the Friends of the People have fought and won the battle in which their sires were temporarily worsted.

The story of the State trials of 1793-1794 forms one of the blackest chapters in the history of Scotland. The leaders and chief organizers of the Friends of the People—Muir, Palmer, Gerrald, Skirving, and Margarot—were successively arraigned for sedition before the High Court of Justiciary and condemned on the flimsiest of evidence. When asked many years afterwards by Lord Cockburn to account for the verdicts returned, one of the convicting jurymen frankly and emphatically answered, "We were all mad"—panic-stricken and horror-stricken by the excesses committed in the name of Liberty by the French Revolutionists, and alarmed lest the popular political movement in Scotland, if not at once restrained and trampled under foot, might later on lead to class violence and civil war and social chaos. The champions of political freedom were therefore, with Tory Dundas as Lord Advocate, or "King of Scotland," and Lord Braxfield as the presiding Judge, made the victims of "Jeddart Justice." The case of Thomas Muir may be briefly outlined as typical of the others. The indictment charged Muir—(1) With having attended a meeting in the town of Kirkintilloch, and there endeavoured "to represent the Government of this country as oppressive and tyrannical, and the Legislative Body of the State as venal and corrupt, particularly by instituting a comparison between the pretended existing Government of France and the Constitution of Great Britain with respect to the

expenses necessary for carrying on the functions of government.” (2) With having advised his uncle and two other men in Lanarkshire to read Pain’s *Rights of Man*. (3) With having helped to distribute what was known at that time as the Paisley Declaration in favour of Reform, and the *Patriot* newspaper, and “other seditious and inflammatory works.” (4) With having, at the Convention of the delegates of the Associated Friends of the People held in Edinburgh, read aloud an address from the Society of United Irishmen in Dublin, which contained such passages as this: “We greatly rejoice that the spirit of freedom moves over the surface of Scotland, that light seems to break from the chaos of her internal government, and that a country so respectable for her attainments in science, in arts, and in arms, for men of literary eminence, for the intelligence and morality of her people, now acts from a conviction of the union between virtue, letters, and liberty; and now rises to distinction, not only by a calm, contented, secret wish for a reform in Parliament, but by openly, actively, and urgently willing it, with the unity and energy of an embodied nation. Our cause is your cause. If there is to be a struggle between us, let it be which nation shall be foremost in the race of mind. Let this be the noble animosity kindled between us—who shall first attain that free Constitution from which both are equidistant; who shall first be the saviours of the Empire? The sense of both countries with respect to the intolerable abuses of the Constitution has been clearly manifested, and proves that our political situations are not dissimilar, that our rights and wrongs are the same.”

Supposing these various charges had been fully proved, it is difficult to see wherein Mr. Muir acted the part of a seditious and disloyal agitator. But a careful examination of the evidence shows that, with perhaps the single exception of the reading of the address from the United Irishmen—surely an extremely innocent act—not one of the charges was substantiated. But the jury was packed, consisting to a large extent of Muir’s personal and political foes; the judges were prejudiced and scandalously overbearing in their manners; and the result was a sentence of fourteen years’ transportation to Botany Bay, in the company of common felons. Nevertheless, Mr. Muir was not cast down or intimidated. His closing words were words of conscious triumph, and not of defeat. After the unjust and cruel sentence had been pronounced, he thus addressed the judges: “Were I to be led this moment from the bar to the scaffold, I should feel the same calmness and serenity which I now do. My mind tells me that I have acted agreeably to my conscience, and that I have engaged in a good and just and a glorious cause—a cause which, sooner or later, must and will prevail, and by a timely effort save this country from destruction.” That cause has prevailed; and though Muir did not live to see its triumph—he died an exile in France in 1798—he had not to wait many months before

his conduct was brilliantly vindicated, and the tyranny of which he was the most prominent victim denounced by the leaders of the Whig party in Parliament. In a debate in the House of Commons in March of 1794, Mr. Sheridan derided the charge brought against the Scotch political martyrs, that they had incited poor people to insist on a Parliamentary reform, when they had only used language and sentiments similar to those employed even by Tory leaders in England. Mr. Whitbread declared that if the law of Scotland was such as was represented by the Lord Advocate, "it was a law of tyranny and oppression, and it was absurd to speak of personal liberty in that country." Mr. Fox, using even stronger language, described the whole features of the trial of Muir as "so strikingly disgusting" as to be almost incredible; and adverting to a statement of Lord Braxfield, that the landed interest alone had the right to be represented in Parliament, and another statement of Lord Swinton that torture was the only adequate punishment of Muir's offence, he exclaimed: "God help the people who have such judges."

Mr. Omond, in his *History of the Lord Advocates of Scotland*, writes that Muir's trial and sentence "created a profound sensation. A deep distrust of the judges was felt by all classes. Not one man in ten, outside the official circle, pretended to believe that he had had a fair trial." But soon the cause of justice prevailed; and the vindication of Muir and his fellow-sufferers has long been completed. There is no monument to which the citizens of Edinburgh or the people of Scotland point with greater pride or affection than the lofty column reared in honour of the political martyrs in the churchyard of Calton Hill. The Reformers who, in 1793-1794, were condemned as traitors and punished as felons, are now looked back to as brave and honourable men, who nobly strove to save their country from ruin, and achieve its freedom. So shall it yet be with the Irish martyrs of to-day. At a banquet given to Mr. Hume in Edinburgh in the evening of the day on which the foundation-stone of the Martyrs' Monument was laid in 1844, Sir James Gibson Craig used language regarding Muir, Palmer, Gerrald, Skirving, and Margarot, which might be applied almost literally to the cases of John Dillon, William O'Brien, and their associates in persecution. "For offences," he said, "for which, if they had been committed in England, only a few weeks or months of imprisonment could have been inflicted (even under the law as it existed in 1793), the martyrs, who had been guilty of no outrage or violence, who were men in most respectable stations of life, and who were all of irreproachable private character, were sent to the hulks, doomed to confinement with the greatest miscreants—to pains and tortures worse than death." Mr. Balfour is nearly a century behind his time. He should have lived during the reign of the Scotch Dundases.

FINLAND AND THE FINLANDERS.

AT a time when Mr. Gladstone is constantly referring to Finland in relation to Home Rule and the present state of affairs in Ireland, and when the Russians, thwarted in their ambitious designs on the Balkan Peninsula by the steady opposition of the European Powers, are casting envious eyes towards the northern extremity of their unwieldy empire in order to pick holes in the Borgo Act of 1809—by which Act Finland was recognized as a practically independent State—it may not be out of place to give here a short account of the position of the Grand Duchy in regard to its colossal neighbour.

The success of Home Rule in Finland can hardly be adduced as a reason for trying the same policy in Ireland, for, apart from historical and other considerations, the simple fact that the Finlanders stand so much higher than the Russians in the scale of civilization alone completely destroys the analogy which the Gladstonian party like to see and to point out to others. The most superficial traveller through Finland will soon be convinced of the superiority of its inhabitants over those of Russia, and the most ardent admirer of the Hibernian race, or the most zealous Home Ruler, will hardly dare to assert that the Irish people, as a body, surpass the English in intellectual powers, culture, or refinement.

There are sufficient grounds for assuming that the great majority of the British public have but a very vague idea of Finland and its people. Many even go so far as to fancy that the Finlander is merely a superior sort of Lapp, and the title of "Russian Finn," usually applied to the hardy mariners who are so deservedly considered as being the best of the large foreign element included in our commercial marine, is not exactly adapted to give a very high status to the individuals so designated.

On turning over the pages of history, we find that Finland was taken possession of by the Swedes seven centuries ago, and from that time the greater part of the country, now comprising the Grand Duchy, was an integral portion of Sweden until 1808, when Alexander I. suddenly declared war (without any adequate pretext, however, for the Swedes had carefully abstained from giving offence to their powerful rivals) and invaded Finland with a large body of

troops. The main object of this war was probably to obtain possession of Sveaborg, a noble fortress, then, as now, considered to be the key of the Baltic. After a gallant and prolonged resistance against the overwhelming forces of Russia, the little Finnish army, unpaid, ill-fed, badly clothed and practically abandoned by Sweden, found itself compelled to cease the unequal struggle, and peace was finally concluded at Frederiksham in 1809. Meanwhile a deputation of Finlanders had proceeded to St. Petersburg to wait on Alexander I. —at his express desire—and that liberal-minded and enlightened monarch was induced to summon the representatives of the four Estates¹ to meet him, so as to come to a satisfactory arrangement concerning the future government of the country. In due course the Estates assembled at Borgo, and the first session of the Finnish Diet was opened by the Emperor in person. His Imperial Majesty declared that, “as the fate of Finland had been left in his hands by the will of Providence, Finland’s throne must henceforth be considered as irrevocably united with that of Russia;” but, at the same time, he solemnly promised to preserve untouched the laws, religion, and form of government of the country, as when under Swedish rule. This generous decision of Alexander I. at once pacified Finland and relieved Russia of great anxiety at a critical period in her history; for, on account of the numerous lakes, the vast, pathless forests, and hilly nature of the newly annexed territory, a destructive guerilla warfare might have been maintained in the land for years, even supposing the Russians succeeded in preventing the assembly of large bodies of troops. There is no doubt that the Emperor acted as above mainly on the advice of the famous Count Speransky, who was married to an English lady, which fact probably accounts for much of the Count’s fondness for representative institutions.

Of the Swedish era in the history of Finland it will be sufficient to state here that Christianity was introduced into the country early in the twelfth century by King Erik the Holy, who was accompanied by Henrik, Bishop of Upsala. Bishop Henrik was an Englishman by birth. He succeeded in baptizing many of the Finns in the neighbourhood of Abo; but a few months later he was cruelly murdered by a fanatic peasant named Lalli, and Henrik the Martyr has since been regarded as the patron saint of Finland. The famous Dominican monk Thomas, who was Bishop of Abo from 1210 to 1245, and who did so much to further the spread of civilization and Christianity in the land, was also born in England, so that we see how early the connection between remote Finland and our own more favoured isles began. This connection has continued ever since, but was particularly accentuated in the seventeenth century, when thou-

¹ i.e. the nobles, clergy, burgesses, and peasantry, the former having hereditary representative rights, the three latter being elected by the duly qualified members of their respective orders.

sands of English and Scotch flocked to the standard of Gustavus Adolphus, "the star of the North and the bulwark of Protestant Europe." Many of these adventurers subsequently settled down in Sweden or Finland, and to this day not a few of their descendants occupy high and honourable positions in both countries. At the present moment in Finland, for example, we find a Baron Ramsay in command of the Finnish troops, a Montgomery among the senators, the brothers Wright among artists, and many others, whose names have either been altered in course of time, or who have been ennobled and given Swedish titles for distinguished services.

The long union of Sweden with Finland has, of course, had the effect of making the latter country essentially Scandinavian, and the Swedish language is still principally used by the upper classes. The peasantry, however, have retained their native dialect, and, as they form the greater part of the population, and education in Finland is almost universal, we find the Finnish tongue spreading and being developed day by day. This has caused considerable ill-feeling on the part of the Swedish party, or "Svekomans," as they are called, the descendants, for the most part, of the original settlers living along the coast (and especially in Helsingfors, Finland's beautiful capital), and comprising undoubtedly the most energetic and intelligent portion of the population. Formerly, though Finnish was never forbidden, nor any attempt made to suppress it, Swedish was alone recognized in the Public Offices, Law Courts, &c., but now these two languages are put on the same footing, and all public functionaries and civil servants are required to pass examinations in both tongues. The present population of Finland is nearly two and a-half millions, of whom rather more than two hundred and fifty thousand are Scandinavians, the rest being the descendants of the Finnic branch of the Turanian family, who migrated or were driven so far north from the shores of the Caspian and the region of the Volga about the commencement of the Christian era. There is no gainsaying the force of numerical superiority, however, so it is not surprising that the "Finnomans," in spite of the steady opposition of the Swedish element, have asserted their claims and pushed themselves forward. It must be confessed that they have given proofs of considerable vitality, and, by building good schools and higher educational establishments in all parts of the country, have succeeded in creating a well-instructed middle class, and in filling the Helsingfors University with students of their own or "National" party, as they like to call it. The virtual suppression of the Swedish tongue in Finland would thus appear to be merely a question of time; and, apart from other sentiments, it seems a pity that a language so unknown, undeveloped, and difficult as the Finnish should be raked up from the obscurity in which it had hitherto lain, and bring with it an element of strife between two peoples who for centuries have been united. Finns and Swedes had always

fought side by side in the many bloody campaigns against Russia, and together they had freely bled under the standards of gallant Gustavus Adolphus, and of the equally gallant but half-mad Charles XII. The Russians on their part were not slow to encourage the Finnoman movement, and having, by means of this apple of discord, succeeded in separating the parties, a wedge has been inserted which will never be withdrawn, as long as the present relations between Russia and Finland exist. Occasional blows from the Imperial sledge-hammer will drive this wedge further and further in, so that, should the Swedish party be entirely outnumbered and crushed, the Finnomans will assuredly find themselves face to face with a far more powerful rival, and will then, perhaps, when too late, regret the short-sighted policy which induced them to ignore and desert their Scandinavian brothers, their great masters in Christianity, civilization, and progress. The object of Russia in so acting is manifest, for, as an autocratic Power, she finds the existence of a constitutional state—a *status in statu*, in fact—within thirty miles of St. Petersburg decidedly inconvenient, but, not wishing to have another Poland on her hands, she cannot well openly retard or oppose Finland's steady advance, however much the Panslavist party in Russia may regret the praiseworthy conduct of Alexander I. in bestowing a liberal constitution on what was then an out-of-the-way country with a numerically insignificant population. Thanks to the age of steam and electricity, to the rapid spread of railways, telegraphs, telephones, &c., throughout Finland, that country has now been brought into nearer contact with the rest of Europe, and continues to take more and more rapid strides on the path of civilization, and a more and more conscious pride in the vitality of its representative institutions. Comparisons may be odious, but they are sometimes inevitable, and it is not surprising that patriotic Muscovites contrast, with considerable envy and jealousy, the progress of Protestant Finland with the actual disturbed and almost stationary condition of Orthodox Russia. The writer, having lived long in both countries, considers himself competent to compare great things with small; but lest, as an Englishman, much common blood—i.e., as far as the Scandinavian element in Finland is concerned—and a practically common religion should have biassed his judgment, it may be as well to put before the reader a few facts in support of the above comparison. The latest official statistics inform us that out of one hundred and eight millions of Russians, not more than 4 per cent. can read and write, whereas in Finland we find that no fewer than 91 per cent. are literate. This highly gratifying result is mainly owing to the zeal of the Lutheran clergy, and to the efforts of the Finnish Government, and is most remarkable when we consider the climatical difficulties and the sparseness of the population, especially in the far north. Surely the above figures are sufficiently eloquent and may be left to speak for themselves!

Though Finland has thus formed a part of the Russian Empire for the best part of a century, neither Russian ideas nor the orthodox faith have made the least impression on the country. There are not more than forty thousand Russians (including the present garrison of Sveaborg) in the whole of Finland, and the Russian tongue is practically unknown, except by certain officials. The Finlanders still chafe under their dependence on Russia, a country with which they have nothing in common; but, though they consider themselves, and undoubtedly are, in many respects, a superior race, there are no signs of the bitter feelings that exist between the Russians and Poles, for instance. Up to the present, at all events, the Imperial Government has given no just cause for complaint—except under the Emperor Nicholas, for that iron-willed monarch, being no friend to constitutional ideas, never summoned a Diet,¹ and the Grand Duchy during his long reign may fairly be said to have “stagnated in the torpor of its dull existence”—and as long as it continues the same policy in regard to its Scandinavian dependency, it may rely on the loyalty and good faith of the population. Should, however, the Panslavist party ever succeed in persuading the Tsar to attempt to Russianize Finland, as the Baltic Provinces and Poland are now being Russianized, the writer does not hesitate to predict the utter failure of the attempt, unless another page of blood be added to the history of Russia, and another small, but gallant and civilized nation be crushed by force. It is fervently to be hoped that such an essay will never be made, and that “Constitutional Finland” will continue to progress, and to form, in the future, as in the past, the brightest jewel in the Tsar’s splendid crown.

¹ The present law is that the Diet must be convoked at least every five years, but every three years is the rule. The next session will be in 1891.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION: ITS WORKING AND ITS RESULTS.

No more favourable opportunity can be looked for than that which is now afforded for "reckoning up" the account of our system of national education established in 1870. The Report of the Royal Commission appointed two years ago to examine into its working marks the termination of a distinct period in our educational history—the inaugural or experimental period. Just eighteen years have elapsed since the first School Boards were elected, and the first serious attempt was made to grapple with the terrible forces of ignorance which held an unchallenged sway over the masses of the English people. The task was a formidable one; there were tremendous arrears to be pulled up. A gigantic organization had to be created. Buildings had to be provided, a staff had to be trained, and methods of working and of testing had to be devised. The expenditure of money, huge as it has been, is of small moment compared with the far greater expenditure of labour, thought, and skill willingly incurred by thousands among the best of our citizens in planning, controlling, and carrying out the stupendous task which Parliament imposed upon the nation. Whatever else may be affirmed of Mr. Forster's Act, it cannot be said that it has not been *tried*. The Legislature and the country were one in hoping and anticipating that great things would follow from its operation. From almost every platform was heard a bold note of joyful prophecy. Men, whose heads were not supposed to be loosely secured to their shoulders, waxed eloquent as they pointed to the prevailing social diseases of the day, and gloried in the great change which education was speedily to bring about. Mr. Mundella had not at that time won the high political rank he has since attained, but he was already in 1870 a man of some mark in the House of Commons, and he observed in the course of the debate on the introduction of the Bill that

"Hundreds and thousands of people were growing up helpless, and in a state of willing dependence, without thrift, energy, or any power of helping themselves, and in their present state with no desire to help themselves. These evils were attributable to the lack of education more than to anything else" (*Hansard*).

It ought to be remarked, however, that the chief framer of the Bill contented himself with a more moderate forecast than was commonly given forth by ardent educationists. Possibly he thought it needful to qualify the rose-coloured visions of those who spoke with more eloquence than judgment, for in his introductory speech he said :

“I am not a fanatic in this matter of education. I know well that knowledge is not virtue, and that no education—much less elementary education—gives power to resist temptation.”

Nevertheless, the general temper of the time is more faithfully represented by Mr. Mundella's language than by Mr. Forster's. The nation was uplifted by the consciousness of a great act performed, and, as is always the case in moments of exaltation, the spirit of prophecy was stirred, and a great hopefulness pervaded the minds of men. Hence arose the powerful impulse which happily came to the aid of the authorities entrusted with the carrying out of the Act, and made possible the gigantic achievements of the years following 1870. This impulse animated alike the sober administrators at Whitehall and the cautious ratepayers of every village. A close examination was instituted of the educational circumstances of each district, and rarely indeed was there any reluctance to comply with the novel requirements of the new law. Within four years from the day on which the royal assent was given, nearly one million additional school places had been provided. Town and country vied with each other in the admirable promptness and energy of their movements. And not even this enormous stride—for which it would be hard indeed to find a parallel—exhausted the force of that remarkable initial impulse, for the next two years (1875–6) saw an even larger proportionate advance; and when the second triennial School Board period came to an end in 1876, it was seen that the number of recognized schools had risen within the six years from 8281 to 14,368; the certificated teachers from 12,467 to 23,053; and the day-school accommodation from 1,878,584 to 3,426,318. Such a six years' record speaks more eloquently than words of the spirit and determination with which the country threw itself into the work of supplying the additional machinery which a compulsory system of universal education necessarily required. From 1876 to 1887 the pace slackened, as might have been expected, but the progress made during that period amply proves that an abundant store of energy is still being expended in “filling in the chinks.” An increase of 4900 schools, and of 1,852,674 places in eleven years following immediately after a great “boom,” tells its own tale of steady sustained devotion and conscientious diligence.

The recently issued Report of the Committee of Council on Education informs us that during the year ended August 31, 1887, the school accommodation has increased by 133,700 places, and now stands at 5,278,992 (almost treble the figures of 1870). As the

estimated population of England and Wales last year was 28,247,000 persons, it follows that school room has now been provided for over 19 per cent. of the whole, and since the population increases by only 1·35 per cent. per annum, while the accommodation increases by 2·6 per cent., it is very plain that the bare necessities of life, from the educationist's point of view, will soon be placed within the reach of every boy and girl of school age in the country; and thus one prime object, towards which all have been straining during the eighteen years now past—the providing a school-room seat for every child in the land—will be practically attained.

It is one thing, of course, to provide the school seat, and it is another thing to get the seat occupied. The proverb about taking the horse to the water suggests possible difficulties which might defeat even the best considered plans. A compulsory system could never be carried out if it went against the conviction of the people. Burke did not know the method of drawing an indictment against a nation; and it would puzzle the most fanatical educationist to contrive means for coercing into school, with anything like regularity, the children of people who had not, at all events, a dim perception of benefits to be derived from the acquisition of knowledge. Happily, as all those know who have had experience of School Board work, the principle of compulsion has been willingly accepted, even by the poorest and the most ignorant. Exceptions there will be.* Some parents are too degraded; some are too utterly indifferent to their children's interest. But in the main, in an overwhelming majority, the poorest class has been the most willing to admit the justice of the obligation which the State has imposed upon parents. At the cost, in thousands of instances, of heavy sacrifice, the boys and girls of the very poor have been willingly sent to school when their fees could with difficulty be spared from the slender purse, and when their labour, either at home or in a neighbour's house, would have given appreciable relief to the parents in their narrow circumstances. A few months' experience on the School Board Committee which deals with breaches of the Bye-laws would convince those who know little of the poor of many things—of their exceeding poverty, their noble patience, their mutual helpfulness, and, not least, of their unlimited capacity for self-sacrifice in the interest of their children's welfare. During an experience of several years, we can hardly recall an instance where the poorest laundry woman or seamstress or town labourer's wife (the woman almost invariably represents the head of the family in these cases), when called upon to send Polly or Tommy more regularly to school, has not shown the sincere desire to comply with the law. The difficulties revealed are generally of a domestic nature—as, that Polly has been kept at home to mind the younger children while the mother was laid up; or that Tommy's old boots are utterly worn out, and until the father gets work it is impossible

to buy new; or that the fees have not been forthcoming, owing to accident or misfortune.

The want of power to grant fees is a serious hindrance in those districts particularly where "denominational" schools preponderate. All that the most sympathetic committee can tell the defaulting mother in such cases is that she must make application to the relieving officer of the parish—a proposal which is commonly met by a distinct and emphatic refusal. Such an application does not carry with it the legal stigma of Poor-law relief, it is true, but it involves the same humiliation and the same loss of self-respect as though it ranked with ordinary "parish-money." The trial to a decent woman of mixing with the degraded crowd at the door of the workhouse, and submitting to all the questioning of a relieving officer, for the sake of the little schooling money which *must* be found in one way or in another, is bitter enough to engender a hatred of the education system which (thanks to Lord Sandon's Act of 1876) compels honest poverty to fall into rank with the debased mob of habitual loafers and slatterns. One of the few commendable features of the recent County Government Act is that the duty of awarding school fees to necessitous parents will next year be taken from the Poor Law authorities and placed in the hands of the new County Council.

Next to the parents in the order of merit as entitled to recognition must be placed the teaching staff of our national system—the body upon whom has rested the main function of rendering education not merely tolerable, but (if it were possible) even popular. That staff consists, when all are reckoned, of not less than 90,000 persons, ranging from the newly apprenticed lad or girl of fifteen through the various grades up to the full-fledged "certificated" teachers, who form about one-half of the whole number. The training of a regular teacher who aspires to the full qualification demanded by the Education Department is more severe probably than that to which most members of the learned professions submit themselves. Through a long course of years they are obliged to pursue a strictly defined and highly arduous course of study. They are tested, at frequently recurring periods, by examinations which infallibly reveal the least want of ability to reach the requisite standard, or of diligence in the pursuit. And throughout they are expected to do daily an amount of work—physically and mentally exhausting—which might well warrant the remainder of the day being spent in ease or in healthy recreation. The *mens sana in corpore sano* is indispensable at the outset of the youthful teacher's term of preparation. And happy is he (or she) if, when the last ordeal is at length passed, and from the training college the grown man or woman steps forth to enter upon the full responsibilities of the profession, neither the *mens* nor the *corpus* is impaired by the years of trial that have been endured.

Many do break down, it is certain; and many others, it is highly probable, suffer through the remainder of their days from the "over-pressure" to which they have been subjected.

When a teacher is once embarked upon his career, a new period of trial begins. The committee of managers, or the parish clergyman who confers the appointment, is usually careful to impress upon the selected candidate the prime necessity of earning a high grant. And as the grant made by the Education Department is a yearly affair, and depends upon the judgment formed by the inspector on his annual visit, it is unavoidable that the eyes of the teacher should be kept constantly fixed upon the "examination-day." Near or distant—next week, or in six months' time—it matters not; the great day of the year fixes itself in the teacher's mind as a terrible day of judgment, always looming ahead. If he is to keep his post, he must earn his grant. If the grant last year was a good one, gained at the cost of weary days and nights of toil and anxiety, so much the more reason why it should be even better this year. One twelvemonth of harassment and labour comes to an end only to usher in another with the same burden of worry. Not many modes of life are so excessively trying to the mind and the body. With a time-table under which every hour of the school day is rigidly appropriated to its special defined subject; with an elaborate system of books to be kept posted, and of statistical returns to be filled in (two sets—one for the local School Board, and one for the Department); with pupil teachers to be overseered and trained; with managers, parents, truants, and faddists to be interviewed—that teacher must indeed be happily constituted in both mind and body whose vital force is not exhausted at an unnaturally rapid rate. Few, indeed, can bear the strain through early manhood and fail to show the consequences only too plainly before the fourth decade of their lives has come to an end. A return furnished not long since relating to an inspectorial district in one of the healthiest parts of the country showed that of 116 teachers employed only the odd sixteen were over forty years of age. The dame schools of the first quarter of the century were generally "manned," if the term may be used, by the worn-out flotsam and jetsam of other callings. Our present system takes its revenge by seizing upon the young and vigorous, and exhausting their energy before they pass one-half of the allotted term of man's life. School teachers are the victims and not, as is often supposed, the inflictors of "over-pressure." It is doubtful whether the profession has any place for men beyond the prime of early middle life, unless good fortune open the way to an assistant inspectorship, a post worth from £150 to £250 a year, for which head-teachers are readily found who will resign situations where they have been earning £300 or £400, in order to enjoy the comparative ease of mind which the change commonly confers. It is impossible in any honest review of the educational position to-day to avoid a condem-

nation of the system which so ill rewards the splendid service that is being rendered by the class of elementary teachers.

Harking back to our first consideration—the high hopes indulged in by Mr. Mundella and a great many others in 1870—it is natural to ask whether the results of the past eighteen years' work can be regarded as fulfilling those anticipations. We have seen that the country has not spared either money or men. The ratepayers have loaded themselves with debts; parents have made willing sacrifices; skilful organizers have directed the operations of ardent enthusiasts; and the teachers—the executive agents of the scheme—have neither spared themselves nor have they been spared. We cannot contemplate the sum-total of this varied expenditure without the feeling that it *must* have made an impression on the heart and life of the nation. And undoubtedly it has. Beyond all question, this great effort has not been made in vain. Tested by any standard which statistics or observation can suggest, the condition of the people in 1888 is indisputably superior to their condition in 1870. The national tone is higher, the national intelligence is keener, the moral sense of the nation is more readily touched. Class barriers have become weakened; some prejudices have disappeared, and others are disappearing; wider knowledge has helped to nurture a larger sympathy. There are still the “two nations” as when *Sybil* was written, but the gulf between is not wider as some whose backward glance is hasty and biassed would have us believe. Nor is the condition of what Mr. Bright has labelled the residuum worse than of yore—though that, alas! is a creed easy to believe. Hear a witness who speaks with the knowledge born of forty years' experience:

“What the condition of the very poor was it is quite impossible to tell, and if it were told it would not be believed to-day. . . . There is no comparison at all [between the present state of things and the past]. The present is like—I was going to say heaven; but it is so immeasurably superior, so altogether changed, that unless one had lived through it and seen the change with one's own eyes, it is hardly possible to credit it.”¹

To claim all the credit for the educationists would be absurd, and most unjust to the noble band of sanitary reformers; who, however, need occasionally to be reminded that the spread of education has been a most powerful factor in the remarkable growth of public opinion favourable to sanitary improvement.

Granting, then, that considerable progress has been made, and that good results of the work of the last eighteen years are easy to discover; it must nevertheless be admitted that (so far) the confident hopes of Mr. Mundella and his friends have not been realized. “The

¹ Mr. H. R. Williams; a veteran worker in connection with the Ragged School Union.

evils" which were "attributable to the lack of education more than to anything else," have been by no means conquered.

Let us glance for a moment at the product of the present system as it is visible before our eyes. Remember that in 1880—to take a date which should place our contention beyond cavil—the machinery was in vigorous working order: let us look around at those in our midst to-day who were then passing through their school life. Of the young men and young women of twenty and thereabouts, whom we now see daily in the streets, in railway carriages, in places of amusement, and elsewhere, it is not extravagant to assume that at least nine-tenths have enjoyed in various degrees the advantages of our national system. They have been under the discipline of teachers, have cowered beneath the eye of terrible inspectors, have sat through Government examinations, and have passed from standard to standard as far as the sixth or seventh in some cases, as far as the fourth in the majority. Their minds have been braced by a close study of arithmetic, enlarged by an acquaintance with history and geography, invigorated by contact with the choicest examples of English poetry and prose. In a word, all that machinery could do has been done. And whatever shortcoming may be discerned in the result is attributable to the fact that machinery cannot do everything, and that what it cannot do is to a great extent left undone. It provides skilful teachers, well-equipped schools, excellent manuals. It marshals the children together from court and alley, from basement and garret; it classifies them scientifically, tests them (within certain limits) accurately, and packs the chambers of their brain with marvellous assiduity. But it can neither stir their imaginations nor touch their consciences. It acquires a certain control (soon, however, lost) over their fears; none over their affections. It impresses them vividly with the importance of passing the annual examination; it impresses them very slightly indeed with any worthy principles of conduct or rules of action. It develops quickness, acuteness, but it fails to bestow what is more sorely needed—a sense of *seriousness*. Indeed, it would sometimes appear that the main result of the working of this "machinery" is an overwhelming and absorbing appetite for the frivolous, together with a vast increase in the opportunities for gratifying the same.

There is a large class, particularly among the dregs of our town populations, upon whom the humanizing influence of an intellectual training appears to be—as far as regards immediate effect—absolutely thrown away. Some personal acquaintance with the loungers of the street-corners will bring this fact home more clearly even than the newspaper reports of East-end savagery. It is not easy to realize that a lad of fifteen who has not yet forgotten his Gray's "Elegy," and will give you the "Burial of Sir John Moore" from beginning to end, may nevertheless be as foul-mouthed and

debased a specimen of humanity as ever Mrs. Fry found in Newgate. But *experto crede*. Any one may make a test for himself among the group of lads whose haunt may be at the nearest public-house corner. And if he ask himself, after making the acquaintance of a few specimens, what is the precise difference that their school training has made to them, it must be answered, as regards thousands of youths of the type with which the papers made us acquainted not long since as the "Tottenham Court Road fellows," and the "Marylebone lads," and the "Lisson Grove gang," that the difference is not one that has so far brought much advantage to society at large. Their wits have been sharpened, but the direction of their mind remains unaltered. The intellectual gifts forced on their acceptance between the ages of seven and fourteen are consecrated to the service of the evil motives they imbibed with their mother's milk. He that was filthy is filthy still, and the filthiness is none the less repulsive because of the additional flavour it derives from a temporary and slight association with better things.

Happily, in the case of some a love of books—of good books—is successfully implanted, and when this happens a ready and joyful road is found that leads steadily up to a higher plane. Few are they that walk therein, but there are some; and their elevation is both the true recompense for past efforts and the most effectual incentive to continued labour. Every poor school has its "white record" of lads whose early predispositions have been vanquished and whose coarse inherited tastes have been refined by contact with cultured teachers and access to good books. But as the mass of mankind is not literary, and values literature only as it feeds the curiosity, the vanity, or the love of excitement of the reader, it seldom happens that the free-will reading of a boy or girl follows far on the line of the "elegant extracts" found in school reading-books. The "Incheape Rock" and the "Wreck of the Hesperus" possess no charm for the juvenile mind straight from the perusal of the newest sheet of comic songs; and even the humour of Dickens (to say nothing of any severer classic) is apt to be unappreciated, so long as the *Boys of England* or a tale of the prosperous pirate or burglar type is to be had. The "recitations" committed to memory for the annual examination are usually forgotten almost as soon as they have fulfilled their purpose of satisfying the inspector. In those favoured towns where free libraries and reading-rooms have been established—in some of which special boys' reading-rooms are provided—the level is probably higher than elsewhere. But the mental dietary of our boot-blacks, errand-boys, and work-girls will be better understood by an inspection of the literary treasures dispensed in third-rate tobacconist shops, than by consulting the reports of the Library Association.

In the life of the class now under consideration the school period

is a mere episode, unpleasant in itself, and almost wholly barren of good influence upon the subsequent career. The home and the street are the really potent factors in fixing the character of the child. Very probably, if the teacher were not burdened as he is, tied hand and foot as we have seen that he is, by the prescriptions of Whitehall and the demands made upon him by his local managers, he might be able to make his influence more keenly felt. If he had time and opportunity for the work of watchfulness, warning, and encouragement; if his position were less that of a taskmaster, and more that of a friend and counsellor; can it be doubted that (except in the matter of percentages) his success would be vastly greater than it can be now said to be? The school ought to be the antidote to the home, the high moral ideal of the one counteracting the low visible examples of the other. Our school system has to cope with the inherited moral perversity and hardness of young children who seem born to belie the beautiful Wordsworthian doctrine:

“Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, who is our home:
Heaven lies about us in our infancy!”

In spite of our school attendance officers, summonses, and painfully devised “standards,” as the illiterate father is, so the school-trained son will be, in default of something more. His ability to read will be put to no better use than to make him acquainted with current scandals and “sport.”¹ His Biblical knowledge will give point to jests which are otherwise no less coarse and gross than those his father made before him. The good gifts and noble capacities which education confers or develops are more than thrown away: they become defiled from an inner source of evil, which (the converse of the philosopher’s stone) turns all fine gold into basest metal. Well did Mr. Forster exclaim, “Knowledge is not virtue.”

It may be answered that the Education Acts were meant to promote knowledge, and not to instil virtue: that they must only be expected to train the understanding, leaving to other agencies the task of purifying and elevating the character. To an extent, no doubt, this is true. Voluntary helpers must step in to supplement the work of public servants. The common impression that the State is doing what needs to be done, and that the more or less willingly rendered contribution of the ratepayer ends his responsibility, and relieves him from the obligation of taking further interest in the education of the poor, must speedily disappear as the circumstances of juvenile life

¹ The remark is made in a leading article of the *Times* (Sept. 20, 1897) that the information given in the sporting papers “is the chief or sole mental pabulum of large numbers, whose elementary education is turned to little use beyond enabling them to study the odds.”

are realized, and the failure of the State organization to furnish the means of deliverance is clearly perceived. Unhappily, one effect of the immense public endeavours has been to extinguish some beneficent private agencies (as Ragged Schools, in many places), which, if less effective from one point of view, were at least equally useful from another. The power that is required to supplement the established system is the power of personal influence applied to the youth of the streets, not only in bulk, but as individuals. The school deals with them in the mass, and in an arbitrary fashion by the force of law. Behind the School Board is the policeman—and not very far behind either, to the perception of the half-fed, half-clad, and more than half-orphaned youth of the slums. This fact of itself militates against the *moral* influence of the teacher, although in other ways it is of course a tremendous help. What is needed in every district is a place of shelter from the polluting influence of the streets, open every evening, and on Sundays, under the charge of volunteers who will aim to understand and to win the confidence of the lads who are just passing out of the school period. They want not a teacher so much as a friend; not instruction so much as converse, and the privilege of contact with persons whose refinement does not exclude sympathy. What the Kyrle Society does in a wholesale way, men and women should do on a smaller scale, to threes and sixes and dozens, always remembering that the essential point is not *what* is said or sung, but *how* it is done—what measure of direct personal grace is thrown into it, and how the slightest act or phrase may be made to tell in favour of pure enjoyment and the moral elevation that comes from habitual personal contact with high-minded people.

But even this is not enough. The position and duty of the school teacher must be reconsidered. Whether he is to continue as a mere medicine man, administering fixed doses of knowledge as regulated from year to year by Act of Parliament, powerless so far as real influence over his victims is concerned, obliged to give them the physic of the Code when what they really need is the milk of human kindness; or whether a larger view is to be taken of the use to which his great opportunities should be put, we leave those to say who have known in their own school history the difference between an Arnold and a Blimber. The tendency of our system has been to put more and more upon the teacher, until he staggers beneath a yoke which neither he nor his oppressors could bear. Paradoxical as it may appear, if he had less to do he would probably do more. Loosed from some of the fetters which check his movements at every turn, he might be able to boast of fewer seventh standard boys, but the loss would be abundantly compensated if he turned out a larger proportion of clean-speaking, honest-hearted, manly lads.

INDIRECT TAXATION IN AMERICA.

IN view of the constant struggle of the working classes and their special representatives to secure aid from the State on their behalf, and of the growing influence of Socialistic ideas, it is a ground of surprise that economic authorities, both in scholastic and political life, should content themselves so much as they do with exhortations to refrain from reliance upon State help and with demonstrations of its danger and futility, while taking so little notice of the interference of the State on the other side and in the wrong direction.

The vast mass of human beings, even in prosperous America, are not much more than half-clothed; and in Europe, they are neither half-clothed nor half-fed, unless mere relief from the pangs of hunger is to be considered a sufficient supply of food, and any sort of concealment of nakedness is to be deemed a sufficiency of clothing. The larger share of annual income, and an enormous majority of the accumulated wealth, fall to the hands of a small minority of the population; and when the majority complain, they are assured that this is the inevitable result of natural laws, and that any interference by the State would only make matters worse.

But suppose that the State has, for centuries, been interfering. Suppose that these same natural laws make it inevitable that it should interfere, on one side or the other. Is it not of the highest importance to inquire what is the effect of that interference? Is it not unreasonable to assume, without inquiry or argument, that the existing form of interference must be indefinitely continued? Is it not mere folly to expect that the masses of the poor will always be content, after attaining political power, to submit without remonstrance to State interference for the benefit of the rich, and yet never ask for similar interference on behalf of the poor?

Such interference has been going on in all countries, for an indefinite period, with the effect of greatly impoverishing the poor and increasing the wealth of the rich. It is still going on, even in countries ruled by democracies; for those who are interested in maintaining this injustice are clever enough to persuade the poor that the system which robs them compensates them by robbing other people in turn for their benefit. It is maintained by statesmen, who do not really wish to injure the poor, simply because it affords the easiest method of raising money, without awakening troublesome

inquiries as to what is done with it. And, while its effects are recognized by all economic writers of authority, few of them have declared unequivocally for its abolition, and none have clearly shown the extent of the wrongs done by it.

But, as all injustice reacts, sooner or later, upon its authors, this particular form of injustice lies at the root of many Socialistic and even Communistic demands. It does more to promote the growth of Socialistic theories among the working classes than can ever be undone by the arguments of statesmen or philosophers. Regarding all Communistic doctrines with disfavour, we still hold that, if Communism is to be allowed at all, it is far more justifiable when taking from the rich for the benefit of the poor, than when taking from the poor for the benefit of the rich.

This most unjust interference of Government, to the impoverishment of the poor, goes by the euphonious name of Indirect Taxation. We have long preferred to call it crooked taxation, which expresses precisely the same idea, in plainer words. It is crooked in its nature, in its motives, in its operation, in its effects, and in its pretexts. There is nothing straightforward about it. If it may be personified, it is safe to say that there is not an honest hair in its head. And it manifests an ingenuity in producing evil results in excess of any which could be anticipated from it which makes it resemble a malign spirit. It creates monopolies; it fosters international hatreds; it discourages industry; it disturbs markets; it deprives society of the full benefits of invention and improvement; it is the parent of the Protective system; and it so distorts the development of productive labour as to make it almost impossible to trace the mischief which it causes.

A few illustrations of this general fact would require a volume. It is proposed, in this short paper, to deal only with a single evil caused by crooked taxation, and to illustrate this only by a few statistics relating to the United States of America. This evil, however, is probably the greatest of all: it is the perpetual and inevitable appropriation of the small savings of the poor to the relief of the rich from their just share of the public burdens, and often for their avowed and direct benefit. Indirect taxation, no matter in what form it may be levied, is, at all times, and in all nations, certain to make the rich relatively richer and the poor poorer. It amounts to a direct interference of the State, for ever increasing those inequalities in the distribution of wealth which modern statesmen, at least, affect to deplore.

It must be conceded, as a partial excuse for the resort to avowedly indirect taxes, that many taxes, nominally direct, are in reality indirect, because they distribute their burden among consumers in the end. Of this description are all so-called direct taxes upon personal property and upon houses or other structures

affixed to land. Such taxes must eventually be paid by consumers, because, if not so paid, the production of such property would fall off until the demand outran the supply to an extent sufficient to compensate, in increased prices, for increased taxation. Such taxes, therefore, have the same effect in promoting an artificial inequality in the distribution of wealth as any other indirect taxes. They are not, however, open to some other grave objections applicable to the taxes commonly called indirect.

In the United States of America, in consequence of an unfortunate provision of the Federal Constitution, requiring direct taxes to be apportioned among the States in proportion to population, not wealth (a provision arising out of the necessities of slavery, and which ought to have been abolished with slavery), the National Government has almost always relied upon indirect taxes only for its revenue, and has had no others for many years. The several States, not having any power to impose duties on imports, have been compelled to resort mainly to so-called direct taxation, which, however, they have attempted to impose equally upon accumulated wealth of all kinds, including both real and personal property. The assessors having placed small valuations on unimproved land, as compared with land cultivated or built upon, the total result has been to put the bulk of the burden upon articles of human production, and thus to shift it in the end upon consumers. Out of the entire tax-burden of 700 million dollars, there can be no doubt that more than 600 millions are practically indirect, as 400 millions avowedly are. How much more, it is difficult to say; and, as it will be easily seen that the amount of really direct taxation is very small in comparison with the total, we have not taken the pains to separate it, but have made the following calculations on the assumption that all the taxes are more or less indirect in practical effect. It was especially not worth while to eliminate the error which is thus involved in these calculations, because it would be obviously impossible to make them scientifically accurate; because other errors must exist in them, of a nature likely to be in the opposite direction, which would more than nullify the error acknowledged; and, finally, because a dozen errors of similar kind would not affect the general result, and could only make the final statement err to an utterly immaterial extent. Where we are dealing with thousands of millions, an error, either way, which cannot amount to a hundred millions, is of no importance.

Taking, then, the taxes of the last census year as a basis, we reach the following conclusions.

In the year of the last census, ending June 30, 1880, the total population of the United States was, in round numbers, 51,000,000, the working population 17,400,000, their tariff taxes £37,500,000 sterling, their internal revenue taxes £30,000,000, and their local

taxes £64,000,000. The burden of taxation upon consumers was increased by an enhancement of domestic prices, under the protective features of the tariff, amounting to at least £110,000,000, by mercantile profits of at least 15 per cent. upon the national taxes, and also upon this increase of prices through protection, amounting to over £27,000,000, and similar profits of at least 5 per cent. upon the local taxes, amounting to another £3,000,000. Thus, while the nominal amount of taxation was £131,000,000, the actual burden imposed upon consumers was over £270,000,000.

The highest estimate of the earnings or income of the whole people, during the census year, which has been made by any responsible authority, is about £2,000,000,000. At least 4 per cent. of this must be allowed for depreciation of the instruments employed in production. The remainder was divided among the 17,000,000 persons engaged in gainful occupations, in widely differing proportions. There being no income-tax in America, there are no statistics from which the amounts of the larger incomes can be accurately ascertained; but the incomes of vast numbers of the labouring classes, as well as of the farmers, are pretty clearly shown by official returns. The average income of farm labourers was less than \$200; of farmers, less than \$400; and of mechanics, less than \$350. The average of the whole may be safely put at less than \$370, or £75. Skilled mechanics averaged a higher rate, say £100; and the superintending class averaged about \$1000, or £200. The incomes of the smaller classes can be fairly estimated, by the aid of the statistics of other countries and of the United States themselves, during the ten years in which an income-tax was levied. The result shall be stated in sterling money, computed at the rough valuation of five dollars to the pound, which is near enough for the purpose.

It is estimated that there are at least 100 persons in the United States whose incomes would average together £200,000 each, 2000 averaging £20,000, 5000 averaging £10,000, and 100,000 averaging £2000. It has been demonstrated by Mr. Edward Atkinson that the average income of 1,000,000 persons is about £200. The actual savings of the nation, during the year 1880, after payment of taxes and all living expenses, are estimated at £150,000,000. But, as some prominent advocates of indirect taxation put their estimate higher, it will suffice to say that, the higher the estimate of national savings, the greater would be the width of the gulf between the rich and the poor, since the amount which the poorer classes have been able to save has been pretty carefully ascertained to be as herein stated.

Indirect taxation, it must constantly be remembered, bears upon the taxpayer in proportion, not to his income, still less to his accumulated property, but solely to his expenditure for the wants or luxuries of himself and those who depend upon him. But, on the

other hand, it is impossible that it should be paid out of any fund except that which each person is able to save, after providing for his own subsistence and that of those who depend upon him; for, if taxes were actually paid out of that part of income which is necessary to maintain the lives of these persons, they would not live long enough to pay it. All taxes, therefore, must, in the very nature of things, be paid only out of accumulations; and it would seem a natural conclusion that taxes should be borne by each person in proportion to his accumulations.

It is manifest that, assuming the bare cost of living to be £60 per family, a tax of 20 per cent. on this would be fatal to a family earning only £70; it would amount to a tax of 100 per cent. on the whole possible wealth of one earning £72; it would be 50 per cent. upon the wealth of one earning £84, and only 1 per cent. on the wealth of one earning or receiving £100,000; while the burden imposed upon an income of £100,000 would be relatively less than the ten-thousandth part of that borne by the income of £72, and less than one-thousandth part of that borne by an income of £100. As a matter of fact, however, the expenses of living increase considerably as the income increases; and taxation increases with them; but these expenses do not rise in any such proportion as incomes do. The actual outworking of the system in America is that the few thousand persons whose incomes exceed £5000 save with ease 60 per cent. of their income; while the 16,000,000 persons whose income falls below an average of £100 save with great difficulty less than 4 per cent. of theirs. These accumulations being practically exempted from taxation in each case, the rich are burdened less than one-fifteenth as much as the poor.

That this is absolutely true, so far as the national taxes are concerned, is never denied. This taxation amounts to much more than half of all taxes. But it is unquestionably equally true of two-thirds of the remaining taxes, as is not denied by any one worthy of notice. Indeed, the advocates of the existing system insist that it is equally true of all possible forms of taxation. That assertion, however, can be easily disposed of.

The tables which will now be given are based upon the foregoing statistics, and upon statements of the annual savings of the mass of the people, published by State officials, after careful investigation. The estimates of savings on the part of the wealthier classes are inevitably mere estimates; but they are certainly not erroneous in any respect which should weaken the force of the argument drawn from them.

Dividing the working or income-receiving population into four classes, their numbers, average incomes, expenditures, and savings are estimated as follows :—

Persons.		Income.		Expenses and Taxes.		Savings after Taxes paid.
7,000	...	£15,000	...	£6,400	...	£8,600
100,000	...	2,000	...	1,700	...	300
1,000,000	...	200	...	180	...	20
16,800,000	...	75	...	72 10s.		2 10s.

Taxation, national and local, with the incidental burdens arising out of it, as already described, amounts to something over 17 per cent. of the total expenditures of all classes. This is equivalent to about five times as much as all that is left to the poorest class; while it is less than one-eighth of what is left to the rich, after satisfying all the demands of reasonable refinement and luxury.

In order to determine what is the effect of taxation, in this form, upon the distribution of wealth among different classes, it is necessary to compute the amount which each class, exercising its present degree of economy, could accumulate, either under this taxation, or without it. The following table, computed upon figures slightly more accurate than those which, for convenience of the British reader, have been given above, shows the result:—

Persons.		Savings if not taxed.		Taxation and Incidents.		Savings after paying Taxes, &c.
7,000	...	£68,670,000	...	£8,670,000	...	£60,000,000
100,000	...	58,900,000	...	28,900,000	...	30,000,000
1,000,000	...	50,000,000	...	30,600,000	...	20,000,000
16,800,000	...	239,578,000	...	199,478,000	...	40,100,000
17,407,000		£417,748,000		£267,648,000		£150,100,000

If these figures are correct, or approximately so, they demonstrate that, if taxation could be wholly dispensed with, the annual accumulations of the 17,000,000 persons, whose incomes averaged little more than £80, would amount to £290,000,000; while the incomes of the remaining 100,000 would amount to £127,500,000. But, after the charges arising out of indirect taxation have been met, the 17,000,000 remain in possession of only £60,000,000; while the 100,000 possess £90,000,000.

In the course of thirty years the result would be as follows:—

Persons.	Without Taxation.	With Indirect Taxation.
16,800,000	£7,200,000,000	£1,200,000,000
1,000,000	1,500,000,000	600,000,000
100,000	1,770,000,000	900,000,000
7,000	2,060,000,000	1,800,000,000
17,407,000	£12,530,000,000	£4,500,000,000

This shows that the necessary consequence of the American system of taxation is to make such a complete change in the distribution of wealth that, while under a perfectly natural system, unaffected by taxation, the 16,000,000 daily labourers would acquire 60 per cent. of the national wealth in thirty years, and the

100,000 capitalists only 30 per cent., taxation more than reverses the proportions, securing to the 100,000 a full 60 per cent., and leaving to the 16,000,000 only 26½ per cent.

We will anticipate a probable criticism upon these figures. In compiling them it has been assumed that the taxes are lost to the country, as they are, and also that the incidental charges arising out of taxation are lost, as they are not, except in part. But it is certain that no part of these profits on taxation goes to the 16,000,000 at the base of the social pyramid; and there is little doubt that the bulk of them fall into the hands of the 100,000 at the top. The foregoing figures, therefore, vastly understate the case against the system, because the accumulations of the wealthier classes are immensely greater, by reason of indirect taxation, than are here set down. But, out of the £130,000,000 which, on the average, are taken from the people annually, in the way of profits upon taxes and enhancement of prices, it is almost impossible to say how much is dead loss, through the continuance of wasteful methods of production in protected industries, and very difficult to say how much each class receives from the actual profits, except that the great mass of the people get none. The most material error which is produced in these calculations by the omission of this factor is that it leaves the gross accumulations, under the hypothesis of no taxes, too large. Assuming that one-half of the enhancement of prices, by reason of indirect taxation, is utterly wasted, and benefits nobody, which is probably the fact, and that the remainder is divided among the capitalistic classes, which is certainly the fact, the following would be an approximate estimate of the effect of the system in thirty years:—

ACCUMULATIONS IN THIRTY YEARS.

Persons.	Accumulations, if Untaxed.	Accumulations, under Indirect Taxation.]
16,300,000	£7,200,000,000	£1,200,000,000
1,107,000	3,380,000,000	3,300,000,000
17,407,000	£10,580,000,000	£4,500,000,000

The last figures are computed upon the assumption that the actual taxes are £130,000,000, as they were in the census year; that the enhancement of prices ensuing therefrom was £140,000,000; that half of this was pure loss, the other half going to the mining, manufacturing, trading, and carrying classes; and that their profits from this source being already included in the estimate of their incomes are not to be added to the second column, although deducted from the first.

But, it will be said impatiently, perhaps: "Taxation cannot be dispensed with: so what is the use of elaborate calculations, showing what might happen if it could be dispensed with?" The answer is obvious: Is it not the first business of statesmen to devise such

methods of taxation as will not interfere with the distribution of wealth, and especially not so as to make the rich richer and the poor poorer? When we have shown what would be the natural distribution of wealth, under the impossible condition of entire freedom from taxation, is it not the duty of financial authorities to find some means of collecting taxes without disturbing the distribution of wealth?

That such a system can be found, when there is any disposition to seek it, could readily be demonstrated; but it is not the object of the present writing to define it. The point now pressed is that, without raising any Socialistic or agrarian question, without discussing any question upon which there can be two opinions, the simple fact of indirect taxation is sufficient to account for the portentous rise of enormous fortunes, of gigantic monopolies, of legislative and elective corruption and of popular discontent, verging at times upon insurrection, in America. It accounts for the well-known fact that the wealth of the country is fast concentrating in fewer hands; a process which must go on, with increasing rapidity, until, within the life of some now living, two-thirds of all the wealth of the American people will be held by less than the hundredth part of its adult population.

That this result need not follow from the mere necessity of taxation, and that it would not follow from any conceivable amount of taxation falling directly upon accumulated wealth, although assessed upon the poor in fully the same proportion as upon the rich, can be shown by a simple calculation. As all wealth must be the result of savings, a tax upon the utmost possible savings of each class, after allowing an expenditure on the scale now usual in that class, would clearly be much less than just to the poor: since they would begin with nothing, while the rich would begin with great accumulations, which, under a tax levied only upon future savings, would escape assessment; and the amount exempted from taxation, as necessarily expended, would be excessive in favour of the rich, as compared with the pittance allowed to the poor. Nevertheless, the following table, constructed upon this defective basis, shows what a transformation might be effected in the social organization if nothing but future accumulations should be taxed.

TABLE SHOWING SAVINGS OF EACH CLASS, UNDER DIRECT TAXATION, ASSESSED ONLY ON FUTURE SAVINGS.

Persons.	Average Income.	Savings of Class, Untaxed.	Equal Tax on Savings.	Net Accumulations.
7000	£15,000	£68,670,000	£20,600,000	£48,070,000
100,000	2,000	58,900,000	17,670,000	41,230,000
1,000,000	200	50,600,000	15,180,000	35,420,000
16,800,000	75	239,578,000	71,873,000	167,705,000
17,407,000		£418,748,000	£125,323,000	£292,425,000

This table has been prepared on the assumption that taxes would be required to the amount of £125,000,000 per annum: that being

more than is now necessary for all purposes, including the gradual payment of the National Debt. Under direct taxation, there would be no mercantile profits or other enhancement of prices; and thus the present tax-burden of £270,000,000 would be at once reduced by more than half.

Upon comparing this table with that which showed the result of the present system, it will be seen that, under indirect taxation, about 100,000 persons secure three-fifths of the annual savings of the people: whereas, under direct taxation, the same persons could secure only three-tenths of the national savings, or only half their present proportion; and yet this would only be a relative change, without injury to them, since the reduction in their actual wealth would be only a mere trifle, owing to the vast reduction in tax-burdens which would thus become possible.

In the course of thirty years, if this process went on without change, the result would compare with that of the indirect system, as follows:—

ACCUMULATIONS IN THIRTY YEARS.

Persons.	Under Direct Taxation.	Under Indirect Taxation.
107,000	£2,679,000,000	£2,700,000,000
1,000,000	1,062,600,000	600,000,000
16,300,000	5,031,150,000	1,200,000,000
<hr/> 17,407,000	<hr/> £8,772,750,000	<hr/> £4,500,000,000

We are aware of only three arguments which are seriously used in favour of indirect taxation. It has been said:—

1. That it is the most convenient method of raising revenue, creating the least friction and opposition in its practical working.

2. That, when levied by means of a tariff, it affords a ready means of protecting home industries and raising wages to an extent which compensates for its admitted injustice to the poor.

3. That the poor, as well as the rich, receive the benefits of government, and ought to contribute to its support; that, in a country where their votes control the expenditures of government, it is dangerous to relieve them from all taxation, since this would make them reckless in expense and taxes; and that they cannot be reached by direct taxation.

The first reason is a solid reason against all indirect taxes. The very fact that they are easily collected and are paid without being noticed is one of the most serious objections to them. It is this fact which makes extravagance, waste, and fraud in public administration easy. It is due to this bad characteristic of the American system that the present Treasury surplus exists, hanging like a cloud over commercial enterprise, and constantly inviting schemes of gigantic plunder.

The second reason needs no refutation here. It is of course utterly false. That which is falsely called "Protection" is mere destruction. The only encouragement which it affords to "labour" consists in forcing the protected labourer to do a greater amount of work to produce the same result which would have been attained without it. So far from ever raising wages, its invariable effect has always been to reduce wages among all classes of labourers; while its general effect in reducing the aggregate of wealth has prevented employers, as a class, from gaining any part of what the workmen have lost.

The third reason is more plausible. But one of the main foundations of even this argument is transparently weak. The claim that the poor ought to be compelled to contribute to the support of government, in order to prevent them from voting for extravagance, is manifestly inconsistent with the idea of indirect taxation, the essence of which is to conceal from the real taxpayer the fact that he is taxed at all. If the poor electors are to have any selfish motive for economy in public expenditures, they must be subjected to some form of direct taxation, rising and falling with the fluctuations of the expenditure. The other branch of the argument has an appearance of abstract reason in its favour. If any plan of direct taxation can be devised which would apportion itself in just proportions between the rich and the poor, according to the ability of each to sustain the burden, this question would deserve serious consideration. We do not say that this is impossible. But, if it is, the oppressive effects of indirect taxation are so manifest as make it clear that, if the alternative lies between doing some injustice to the rich or an enormous injustice to the poor, the former course should unhesitatingly be adopted. Taxation can never be carried to such an extent as to be actually ruinous to the rich; it is now, and always has been, carried to that extent against the poor.

It may be said that a middle course should be pursued, and that indirect taxation should be adopted to such an extent as would lay only their fair share of the public burdens upon the masses. But, in order to do this, such taxes must be small, and must not, even with the mercantile profit added, exceed the proper share of the masses. It is impossible to calculate the amount of such taxes; because it is impossible to foresee how much will be added to the tax by the incidental private profits arising out of it, all of which must be paid by the consumer. It is, moreover, utterly impracticable to keep indirect taxes within these limits, even if they could be ascertained. The temptation to resort to them, in preference to direct taxes, is irresistible, so long as they are allowed at all.

It is not necessary, however, to pursue this inquiry any further; the object of this paper being to show the disastrous effect of existing methods of taxation, rather than to discuss any plans for a remedy. A majority of the so-called statesmen of America

profess to be proud of these methods, and have persuaded nearly half their countrymen that the American system of taxation is the glory of America, and that hard-working men could not live if they were not heavily taxed. It is therefore necessary to show, in plain figures, just what is the effect of this beneficent system, and what an admirable device it is for the aggrandizement of the rich and the destruction of the poor.

In conclusion, it may be well to repeat that accuracy is not claimed for any of these figures, except where drawn from official statistics. The estimate of the burden of protective taxes, especially, is hotly disputed ; and, indeed, that burden varies greatly in different years. But no conceivable change in this estimate would affect the relative proportions of the burdens imposed upon the several classes, or do more than postpone, for ten or twenty years further, the general result here predicted—the concentration of wealth in a few hands.

THE MEMOIRS OF THE DUKE OF COBURG.

AN autobiography of any description, we are often told, can scarcely fail to be interesting, and this is especially true of a narrative of great and important events, written by one who had himself a large share in them. Such compositions are, indeed, among the most valuable species of contemporary historical evidence, and any fresh addition to their number must be welcomed by all students of the past. And assuredly there are few eras in history of greater interest and importance than the epoch of the revolutionary movements in 1848, which, though apparently without much result at the time, yet paved the way for two of the greatest events of the present century—the formation of a united Germany and a united Italy.

Hence the recent publication of the *Memoirs of Duke Ernest of Saxe-Coburg*, which throw an additional light on the events of this momentous period as far as German history is concerned, will deservedly receive the attention of all historical students.

The author of the memoirs comes of a distinguished family. His father had a considerable share in the liberation of Germany from Napoleon, and was one of the most liberal and enlightened German princes of his time. His uncle Leopold was the first king of Belgium, and his brother Albert is still remembered by all Englishmen as the late Prince Consort.

Duke Ernest was born as long ago as 1818, so that he is now seventy years old. He has not recorded many incidents of his childhood, but he speaks with great reverence of his father, and tells of the care bestowed on his education and that of his brother. The first time he travelled beyond the bounds of his native country was in 1832, on a visit to his uncle, who had recently accepted the Belgian Crown. Four years later, he made, in conjunction with his brother, a journey of a more extended character, which his father had planned for his sons as part of their education. They first of all visited England, where they made the acquaintance of several distinguished persons. Of King William IV., Ernest writes: "The King was already sickly at that time, and I remember that he fell fast asleep during dinner. He impressed me as being a thorough

¹ *Memoirs of Ernest II., Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha*. Vols. I. and II., embracing period 1818-1850. London: Remington. 1888.

sailor, unimportant in all other respects." Among other celebrities, he met Disraeli, of whom we have this account: "At this period he produced the impression of a vain young Jew of remarkably radical tendencies. The time came later when he understood how to make calculated use of the Conservative Tories. He carried his left arm in a black sling, which peculiarity was sneered at by his enemies, who said that he only did it in order to make himself interesting, as he had never suffered any accident which rendered it necessary. He seemed to belong to the class of men who have made up their minds to play a great part, and who are certain to gain the end in view."

From England the young princes proceeded to France, where they were kindly received by the reigning king, Louis Philippe. "I may say that a kind of sympathy arose between him and me, such as may be imagined between a youth and a man standing on the threshold of old age."

After a lively stay in Paris, the brothers arrived in Brussels, and remained for nearly a year at their uncle's Court, where they continued to pursue their studies. Their life in Belgium is described as very enjoyable, and they formed the acquaintance of many distinguished men "of all colours and aims." In this way they imbibed principles of a much more liberal character than were current in most German royal circles at this period. "One was, so to speak, pushed into the ranks of reform, hardly being given any choice."

In 1837 they returned to Germany, and completed their education at the University of Bonn. At the close of their college career the brothers parted for the first time. The English marriage was now almost settled for Albert, while Ernest entered the Saxon military service. He was warmly received by the King of Saxony, Frederick Augustus, in whose Court he was, he tells us, "treated like a son and companion of long date."

His residence at Dresden lasted about four years, but was broken by several "long and eventful journeys and undertakings."

In 1840 he accompanied his brother to England, on the occasion of his marriage, and afterwards paid a visit to Spain and Portugal to visit his cousin Ferdinand, who had married the young Portuguese Queen, Donna Maria.

He gives an interesting account of his experiences in a letter to his brother. Of his cousin he writes: "Ferdinand has grown to be a very agreeable young man, both physically and mentally. His figure is slender and well-formed, and his face, although it is on the whole unchanged, has assumed a much milder expression. His movements are very graceful, and his demeanour quite that of a king." Of the Queen of Portugal we are told that "Donna Maria is at the first glance a psychological conundrum, if I may be allowed

to use the word. I have set myself the special task of studying her. She is stout, yet by no means so ill-formed as people pretend; her head is fine, and none of the pictures which exist of her do her justice. She never speaks to strangers; wastes but few words on the courtiers, but to us and our acquaintance she talks a great deal. What is taken for embarrassment is really design, and what so many have called want of education is simply originality. I take her for a thoroughly clever woman, for, as long as I have been here, I have never heard a mistaken or illogical opinion from her lips, nor any flat or hasty remark."

After a short stay in Spain, Prince Ernest returned to Dresden, at a critical time when Germany and all Europe were excited by rumours of a general war, arising out of the Turkish-Egyptian Question and the conflict of French and English interests in the East.

The Prince's uncle, King Leopold, was anxious to avert this calamity, and he had a considerable share in the negotiations, which resulted in the preservation of peace.

This same year witnessed a change in the position of German affairs, brought about by the death of Frederick William III., King of Prussia, and the accession of his son, Frederick William IV.

Prince Ernest had been on very friendly terms with the new Sovereign when the latter was Crown Prince, and he was considered to be the most suitable ambassador to conduct certain negotiations between Coburg and Prussia concerning an exchange of territory. An agreement between the Governments had been arrived at in the lifetime of the late Prussian king, and Ernest was now employed by his father on a mission to secure its ratification by Frederick William IV. His majesty, however, was found by no means disposed to fulfil his father's promises. "He flew into a most incredible temper, 'Do you think that I am going to continue all the stupidities which my father began,' he cried, his face red with anger. 'Those counsellors who spoiled and used everything were blockheads!' and continuing to thunder out his ill-feeling against the past Government, he broke the inkstand in two, so that the ink flew out in all directions, and the painful moment was brought to a close through the accident. Upon this he excused himself, grew perfectly mild again, and went on in the most friendly and polite manner to say that he really could not agree to the exchange of the territory."

In 1842 the Prince married the heiress Alexandra of Baden, and after his marriage he paid a second visit to England and France in conjunction with his wife. He returned home in the middle of 1843, and in January of the next year he was called to the ducal throne of Coburg by the sudden death of his father.

He fully recognized the critical character of the period in which he was now to play a rather prominent part. "I felt perfectly convinced

that the world, and particularly Germany, stood on the brink of an epoch of the most powerful political changes, and that not one of the Princes of Germany, who had become rulers, could look forward to a quiet existence such as had been the lot of my father's generation for the last thirty years."

His presentiments were well-founded, for his reign had hardly lasted four years before all Germany was involved in the turmoil of the great revolution, the events of which occupy the principal part of these volumes.

To produce the explosion of 1848 two movements contributed, both of which had for some time been working in the public mind of Germany, and which, though often confounded, were essentially different in character.

There was what may be termed the party of German unity and constitutional freedom, which desired to return to the ancient historical traditions of Germany in the days when it was a strong and united kingdom. Their objects were to draw closer the bonds between the different States, and to change the ban confederacy which existed into a real federal union. They wished to lessen the influence of Austria in German politics, which was always exercised on the side of reaction and division among the separate States, and many of them were already looking to Prussia as the head of united Germany, though the character of the Sovereign afforded little hope that he would show any sympathy with their purposes.

Besides this movement, which was purely national in its origin, there was an influence of a more revolutionary character, which had its source, not within the limits of Germany, but in France.

Translations of French democratic and socialistic works were widely circulated among the German lower classes notwithstanding the utmost efforts to check their propagation, and many German workmen who had been employed in Paris had there imbibed the same principles, which they carried back with them to their native country.

Secret societies were formed to carry out the objects of the socialistic party, and how extended its ramifications might be hardly any one knew. Hence there was a general feeling of insecurity on the part of the German rulers, but most of them only thought of keeping down the revolution by force, if possible. Their lack of wisdom is clearly exposed by Duke Ernest in his narrative. Had the German Sovereigns generally pursued the policy which he saw to be the wisest, and carried out as far as he could, of placing themselves at the head of the constitutional party, then, in all probability, little danger would have been apprehended from the attempts of the extreme revolutionists, but it was the assumption by most of the Princes of an attitude of resistance to all reform, which gave the latter party its power.

Especially was this the case as regards the Prussian King, Frederick William IV. If he had been willing to take up the position which the majority, not only of his subjects, but of Germans, generally desired, the events of 1870 might have been anticipated, and the union of Germany secured without probably much disturbance, but his persistence in clinging to a policy of reaction and subservience to Austria was answerable for many disasters.

Duke Ernest had not, we have seen, long been expecting an outburst, but when the crisis was precipitated by the expulsion of Louis Philippe from the French throne, he was in England on a visit to his brother.

Soon there came the news of the general popular upheaval throughout Germany, and the Duke perceived the necessity of an immediate return to his own dominions. He had little personal danger to apprehend from the course events were taking. He had granted a liberal constitution to his subjects, and was popular among them, and every address he received from them breathed nothing but "universal assurances of fidelity and adherence." Still, however, the movement in favour of national unity which was working throughout Germany was felt in Coburg as well as elsewhere, and it was highly desirable that the Duke, who was known to sympathize with it, should be on the spot to guide it and direct it in the proper path. On his return, in March 1848, he received a petition from the people of his territories, somewhat bombastic in strain, but thoroughly loyal and reasonable in spirit, asking for various reforms, including freedom of the Press and trial by jury, and beseeching his co-operation as a member of the German Confederacy in the work of securing national unity.

The Duke responded in a similar spirit, thanking his subjects for the attachment they had shown towards him, and promising to carry out the reforms they demanded, which he had already begun to execute. He further expressed his sympathy with the wish for the closer union of the German States, and announced that he was strongly in favour of the proposal for a universal German Parliament.

The wise policy of the Duke had its reward. His own dominions were little troubled by the operations of the ultra-revolutionary party. Concord prevailed between prince and people, and a new settlement of the constitution of the duchy was established on a liberal basis, which continued in force when the anarchy which prevailed in many neighbouring States at the time had given place to returning despotism.

The Duke's position at home was so secure that he could afford to turn his attention to the affairs of his neighbours. In the adjoining State of Altenburg matters were in a critical condition. The reigning Duke Joseph was a man of weak intellect, and

under the influence of unpopular counsellors. As he had not, like Duke Ernest, attempted to moderate the popular movement by placing himself at its head, it had passed into the hands of the violent party. Disturbances broke out everywhere, which could not be put down, and at last "Revolutionary bands surrounded the castle, in which the entire ducal family were as it were held imprisoned."

On the receipt of this news Duke Ernest determined to go to the relief of his brother Sovereign. The narrative of what followed is best told in his own words: "I took my place like any ordinary traveller in a second-class carriage, and arrived almost unrecognized in Altenburg. My companion and I then went to an hotel which stood near the station, where we had an opportunity during dinner of making inquiries of the landlord as to what had occurred. He assured us that it was quite true that the Duke was imprisoned and cut off from every one. To the question: 'By whom?' the man answered with the pathos of a schoolmaster, who has just described the terrors of the French Revolution and the sufferings of the prisoners: 'He is in the power of the Provisional Government and is watched by the citizens' guard.' 'Would it be impossible to get into the Ducal Palace?' 'Quite impossible,' answered the landlord without hesitation. . . . I was so astonished and provoked by all this that it made me the more eager to carry out my intention at any price. . . . The drive up to the high castle of Altenburg led round the next street corner through a closed barricade, and the guard had orders to let no one in or out. At the moment I reached it, it fortunately happened that an officer belonging to the militia came up to change the guard; I immediately told him who I was and that I wished to speak to the Duke. . . . After all these negotiations I at length got into the castle, and thought I had conquered the chief difficulties. But I was mistaken in this, for my worst experiences were to be made with the Duke himself. The moral state in which I found him is hardly to be described, wavering between yielding and hopelessness, it seemed almost impossible to hold a quiet discussion with the Duke."

However, Duke Ernest at last succeeded in his mission, and the affairs of Altenburg were settled by an amicable arrangement between the Prince and the people.

Meanwhile, events of the greatest importance were taking place on the wide stage of German politics. In almost every State there had been popular risings and the princes had nearly everywhere been forced to make concessions to their subjects. In Austria itself, the stronghold of reaction and the centre of opposition to all Liberal movements, the man who for thirty years had been the chief force

antagonistic to reform in Germany, the Chancellor Metternich had been obliged to retire, and the Government was for many months almost powerless. The effect of the revolution in Vienna was felt everywhere. "The overthrow of the system in Austria in which so many German Governments had seen their only reserve, robbed the Conservative forces in the smaller States of their last hope and remaining courage."

In Saxony, Bavaria, and the rest of the minor German States, the reforming party gained the upper hand, and the Sovereigns were obliged to yield.

The point, however, to which the eyes of all Germans were turned with the greatest interest was Berlin, and the question most eagerly discussed was the attitude of the King of Prussia.

The position taken up by Frederick William IV. was indeed rather difficult to understand. There had been popular disturbances in his capital as in other places, but he had not been reduced to such a condition of helplessness as many of his fellow Sovereigns. In fact, there was little hostility to his person, and he had a great opportunity before him, of which, however, he failed to take advantage.

At one time he seemed to be opposed to all reform whatever, at another he appeared to be willing to surrender entirely to the extreme Revolutionary party, but he never showed any inclination to take the position of the leader of the movement for German unity, which constitutional Liberals every where hoped for from him.

Amid all this confusion and uncertainty, one great step appeared to have been gained by the assembling at Frankfort of a really national and representative Parliament of all Germany, in place of the old Confederate Diet, which merely represented the princes.

The German Sovereigns had been compelled by the pressure of public opinion to consent to the meeting of this Assembly, and great things were hoped from it by all the reforming party. As soon as this body met, it began to devote itself to the work of drawing up a Constitution for the whole of Germany. There was a general agreement that the new Confederacy should have a head, with the title of Emperor, and the almost universal desire was that the Prussian King should accept the post.

What was wished, in fact, was to revive the old German kingdom of the days of the Franconian and Swabian Emperors, when Germany had been one of the strongest and most united nations of Europe.

Though the chief of the Confederation was to bear the title of Emperor; there was no idea of calling up from the shades of the past the phantom of the Holy Roman Empire, which had, in fact, been the fatal cause of the disintegration of the German kingdom. The King of Prussia, however, appears seriously to have thought such a revival both possible and desirable. In a circular to the Princes,

he said: "The German nation has a right, dating back a thousand years, to make its head the indisputable First Head of Christendom." It was absurd enough to suppose that such a pretension would be accepted by Europe in the nineteenth century, but still the statement was historically correct in so far that in the Middle Ages the elected Sovereign of Germany was the only person who had a right to be named Emperor of the Romans, and that the Roman Emperor was in theory regarded as superior to all other kings and princes.

But when his Majesty went on to speak of the Roman Imperial dignity as having been united "indissolubly with the hereditary Empire of Austria," and to allege this as a reason against his own acceptance of the position of German Emperor, he was talking absolute nonsense.

After the labours of Mr. Bryce and Mr. Freeman, it can hardly be necessary to state that such a title as "Emperor of Austria" was unheard of before the present century; that it is true that since the fifteenth century it had become the usual custom to elect the Archduke of Austria King of Germany and Roman Emperor, but that he had certainly no hereditary right to command the votes of the electors. And in fact, on one occasion, as late as the middle of the eighteenth century, the rule was broken through, and an Emperor who was not an Austrian archduke, elected in the person of Charles VII. of Bavaria, who was as lawful an Emperor as any other, though his claims on the hereditary Austrian dominions were not well founded.

It became evident that the refusal of Frederick William IV. to accept the Imperial title was the rock on which the Frankfort Assembly would split. Though the formal offer of the position to the Prussian King did not take place till the early part of 1849, yet it had been evident long before then that he could not be prevailed on to accept it, and without a head the new German Constitution could not be worked. A temporary Administrator of the Empire, as he was styled, was chosen in the person of the Austrian Archduke John, but he seems to have been a man of little force of character.

He gave satisfaction to nobody, and at last ran away from Frankfort in a rather undignified manner.

The failure of the attempts to settle matters on a constitutional basis of German union, gave scope to the effects of the revolutionary party, which otherwise would have been little formidable, and there was on one occasion a republican rising in Frankfort, and actual fighting and bloodshed in the streets only put down by the intervention of Austrian and Prussian troops. The Duke of Coburg, who was present at the time, gives the following account of the struggle:—

"I went away to the Roman Emperor Hotel to dine. About 150 paces

from here, where the line is extended to the small streets, the barricades were built. A Prussian detachment stationed itself underneath the Roman Emperor. They were derided from the barricade but did not move. Some of them were shot dead before my eyes by men in the houses, armed with rifles; they did not move. At length they were allowed to shoot. A few discharges in files scattered the insurgents; but from behind the barricades and the windows several more of their men were wounded with rifle bullets at a good distance. Smoking my cigar on the balcony, I heard a bullet whistle before my nose, and—my cigar was out, for the bullet had cut it in two."

The refusal of the Imperial title by the King of Prussia and the withdrawal of the Archduke John from Frankfort put an end to the hope of a united German Empire. The Assembly shortly afterwards broke up, and a less ambitious plan was now devised by the Constitutional party, among whom Duke Ernest was prominent, of a voluntary confederation of such German States as could be induced join it, under the leadership of Prussia.

Meanwhile, another question had been rising into prominence, which occupies nearly one-half of the second volume of the Duke's memoirs, and the narrative of which forms one of their most interesting parts, as the author here, more than elsewhere, writes from direct personal experience. This was, the position of Schleswig-Holstein relatively to Germany and to Denmark.

The ideas of most Englishmen on this subject were decidedly hazy at the time, and are probably not much clearer now. It is true, there was some excuse for this want of knowledge, since many of the details of the question were of a very complicated character, but still the main facts admit of being stated in a moderate compass.

These two duchies had for centuries been held by the Danish kings as hereditary dukes, but neither of them formed part of the kingdom of Denmark any more than Hanover formed part of England when the two were united under one Sovereign.

The position of the two was, however, not quite the same. Holstein had been a fief of the old Empire, and was a member of the Confederation which had succeeded it. Its population was entirely German, and it was always reckoned as part of Germany. Schleswig, on the other hand, although for a long period closely united with Holstein had never been a fief of the Empire, and was not counted as a member of the German Confederation. Its population was of a mixed character, being German in the South, and Danish in the North, and there was much jealousy between the two nationalities.

It will be thus evident that the matter was a delicate one, and that disputes between Denmark and Germany were nearly certain to arise; and a further element of complication was added, by the fact that, though the King of Denmark's right to be Duke of Schleswig and Holstein was not denied, yet he was not the only person who

had hereditary claims there. The German family of Augustenburg were Stadtholders and commanders-in-chief of the forces of the Duchies by right of birth, and conflicts between them and their superiors, the Danish dukes, were nearly certain to arise.

During the reign of Christian VIII. of Denmark matters were evidently drawing to a crisis. A strong party among the Danish people had begun to advocate the incorporation of Schleswig with the Danish kingdom, and the King was said to have prepared a scheme for carrying out their wishes. The people of Holstein were violently opposed to such a proposal, contending that it threatened danger to their liberties as well, and that in any case the two duchies could never be lawfully separated. They demanded, on the other hand, that Schleswig as well as Holstein should be recognized as belonging to the German Confederation.

They as yet professed loyalty to the Danish Sovereign as their duke, but there were evident symptoms of a desire to get rid of the connexion with Denmark altogether and convert the hereditary stadtholders of the Augustenburg house into dukes. Affairs were in this position at the commencement of the critical year of 1848, when Christian VIII. died, and was succeeded by his son Frederick VII.

The new king took a step which precipitated matters by drawing up a resolution for his whole dominions, which provided for a "union of the Parliaments of all the different portions of the Danish monarchy."

This was considered to threaten the annexation of Schleswig and even of Holstein to Denmark, and led to the immediate outburst of revolution in the Duchies, and the formation of a Provisional Government. The leaders of the movement professed loyalty to their duke, but contended that the rights of Holstein as a German State had been violated, and called for the aid of the other members of the Confederation.

The entrance of German troops into the Duchies soon followed, and hostilities ensued, which, however, were soon terminated, for the time, by an armistice. A period of intricate negotiations succeeded, in which many schemes were devised for settling the question. The most reasonable plan suggested was, that the Danish part of Schleswig should be incorporated with Denmark, while the German portion should be closely united with Holstein and be admitted into the German Confederation, the Danish king retaining his rights as Duke, but giving up all projects of joining the Duchies to his kingdom.

Such an arrangement would certainly have been the one most in harmony with the wishes of the inhabitants of the territories, and a settlement on this basis was what was desired by the wisest German statesmen, including Duke Ernest, and was also strongly advocated

by his brother, Prince Albert, who took a considerable interest in the negotiations concerning a question which was felt to affect not only Germany and Denmark but Europe at large.

However, it was found impossible to arrive at a peaceful solution of the difficulty, and hostilities recommenced in the spring of 1849.

A German Confederate force was dispatched to the aid of the Schleswig-Holsteiners, and Duke Ernest commanded the troops from his own State. The first encounter of the war was a naval battle in the harbour of Eckernförde, in which a Danish attack was repulsed. The Duke was in command of the German forces on this occasion, and has given an interesting narrative of the fight, from which there is only space to quote the following description of the blowing up of a Danish man-of-war: "Suddenly several cannons on board went off, and soon a frightful explosion resounded, and a mighty pillar of fire shot up to the sky. Wood and pieces of iron, the ruins of a ship, as well as guns and pieces of ordnance, flew into the air like balls, and the next moment the shore and the swelling sea were covered with them. It was a wonder that of all the people surrounding the harbour and looking on at the sight, not a single one was killed. Thousands of tongues of flame lighted the moving scene; glowing cannon balls strewed the shore, side by side with burning beams and all kinds of things. Exploding grenades burst and thundered, and cartridges went off. When the noise began to subside, we could hear the terrible cries of the men for help, as they fought the last fight of that fearful day with the waves."

Some other successes followed, but the fair prospects for the Schleswig-Holstein cause, with which the war had opened, were soon clouded over. The Prussian Government, which supplied the greater part of the Confederate contingent, could not be brought to consent to energetic action through dread of Russia, which was threatening to intervene on the Danish side.

An attack on the Danish fortress of Frederica was disastrously repulsed, and immediately afterwards the King of Prussia hastened to conclude an armistice by which Schleswig was to be occupied conjointly by Danish and Prussian forces, and the rest of the German troops were to be withdrawn. This agreement was regarded throughout Germany as a humiliating surrender; a feeling fully shared in by Duke Ernest, whose military exploits had won him general popularity.

The King of Denmark began to treat Schleswig as a conquered province, and the Prussian army of occupation offered no opposition to his wishes.

He refused to use the title of Duke of Schleswig, and was evidently determined to treat the Duchy as part of Denmark.

Holstein still retained its independence under the provisional

Government, but its position was very precarious, and it could not hope to hold its own, if hostilities were renewed, without German aid.

Many remonstrances were addressed to the King of Prussia on the state of affairs his action had brought about, but he was too much afraid of Russia to take any other course, and in 1850 the armistice was succeeded by a treaty of peace, professedly on the basis of the *status quo ante bellum*. This practically surrendered everything to the King of Denmark, as it provided for the enforcement of his hereditary rights in the Duchies, without any security for their privileges, and also ordered the withdrawal of the Prussian troops from Schleswig, while the Danish army was free to remain there.

The Holstein Government refused to accept the treaty, and maintained a gallant struggle for some time single-handed. Being, however, deserted by the German princes they were forced to succumb.

The Prussian king was not even content with abandoning the cause of the Duchies, but took upon himself the task of Confederate execution in Holstein, to enforce the terms of the treaty. "The brave army was dissolved, and the country, tied hand and foot, given over to the revenge of the Danes."

No impression surely can be produced by this melancholy narrative on the mind of any one who believes, as most Englishmen do, that nations have a right to choose their own government, but that the Danes were in the wrong.

The only part of the duchies where the population was Danish and desired incorporation with Denmark was the northern portion of Schleswig, and it is evident that this might easily have been separated from the German districts if the Danes would have consented.

It showed, then, that great ignorance must have prevailed on the question when we find that even at this period public feeling in England was on the Danish side, and was expressed in a much more effusive form of sympathy with Denmark when the struggle was renewed fourteen years later. No doubt at the latter period an injustice was done to Denmark by the placing of the Danish population of Northern Schleswig under German rule, but this was a not altogether unmerited retribution for the wrong which had been previously done to the much more numerous German population of Southern Schleswig and Holstein. It must, however, be admitted that the disgraceful way in which Prussia had abandoned the cause of the Duchies in 1850 afforded good reasons for attributing her action in 1864 to merely selfish motives of aggrandizement, and certainly no justification can be pleaded for her conduct in swallowing up Danes and Germans alike as she then did.

Before the final close of the Schleswig-Holstein war, events in Germany had already taken a course which showed that all hope of national unity at that time was but a dream.

The new union under Prussian leadership was entered into by most of the North German States, but the great southern kingdoms of Bavaria and Wurtemberg held aloof, while Austria, which, by the suppression of the Hungarian revolution was enabled to take up her old position as the champion of reaction, was openly hostile.

The Parliament of the Confederacy met at Erfurt in the early part of 1850, and in a short session drew up the draft of a Constitution.

A congress of the Princes of the Union followed, summoned mainly by the exertions of the Duke of Coburg, and held at first at Gotha, in his own dominions, but afterwards transferred to Berlin.

There really seemed to be a good prospect of success for the new union, and the King of Prussia for the first time seemed really to be likely to fulfil the expectations entertained of him by the party of German unity.

Austria, however, persisted in her attitude of determined hostility, and seemed disposed to resort even to arms to maintain the old system of the Confederate Diet which had existed from 1815 to 1848, and which had practically enabled her to give the law to Germany.

She declared the new Confederation to be a breach of the constitution of the Germanic body, and summoned a meeting of her allies, chief among whom was Bavaria, at Frankfort, which, though merely a sectional gathering, arrogated to itself the functions of the old Diet.

A dispute about the electorate of Hesse brought matters to a crisis.

The Elector of that State had been involved in a dispute with his subjects in consequence of his having attempted to levy taxes on his sole authority. He had been obliged to take flight, and had invoked the aid of the Frankfort Diet. As might be expected from a body so entirely under Christian influence, it was ready enough to help a prince against his people, and Bavarian troops were ordered to be sent to restore the Elector's authority.

As Hesse was a member of the new union, and as the conduct of the Elector was an entire violation of the Constitution drawn up at Erfurt, it was felt by all the States of the Confederacy that the interference of Bavaria was not to be tolerated.

Prussian troops surrounded Hesse, and war seemed imminent. It was evident that Austria would come to the help of her Bavarian ally, and a struggle between her and Prussia was universally expected, and almost desired by many, in the hopes that a decisive Prussian mutiny would secure the freedom and union of Germany.

Again, however, the King of Prussia showed how futile were all expectations based on the assumption of his firmness of purpose.

He withdrew from the Union, of which he was the head, and of

course its dissolution followed, to the regret of all German patriots, and especially of Duke Ernest, who had done so much to bring about its formation.

At this period of disappointment and humiliation the author brings the present portion of his memoirs to a somewhat abrupt termination, but no doubt with the intention of continuing them in the future.

The style of his narrative cannot be said to be lively, and those who look for light matters of a personal kind will not find much to suit their taste. He may, too, be charged, to some extent, with the fault to which writers of his class are particularly liable, of alluding to facts and circumstances without fully explaining them, and taking for granted more knowledge than the reader possesses.

However, his work is certainly one of great value to the student of the important period of which it treats, and it may be hoped that further instalments of it will add considerably to our information about more recent portions of German history.

HOME AFFAIRS.

THE Autumn sittings of Parliament began with an uneventful fortnight, devoted almost exclusively to Supply. And it is unfortunately necessary to write when the fight on the Government proposal to give another five millions without security to Lord Ashbourne's scheme of Land Purchase in Ireland, is only partially developed. Hence it is hardly possible to deal with this last important matter as one would wish. At the same time, the month has not been without matter of interest. It includes Mr. Gladstone's descent upon Birmingham, which alone would distinguish the political record of November 1888. Of this wonderful enterprise something detailed must be said. But first as to the general situation. This is decidedly better for such as ourselves, who favour the views of the popular party in Ireland. About that we can have no doubt. Proof absolute can be given: witness, for instance, the municipal elections and the issue of the contest at Dewsbury. But apart from these things, there is what is equally important—that indefinable something in the air which says, not less emphatically, that things are going well. And this, though we have had four weeks of the Parnell-*Times* Commission, and have seen the great twin brethren of the Unionist Alliance—the Prime Minister *de facto* and the Prime Minister *de jure*—sitting together at the table of the Irish Non-conformist ministers. Something, no doubt, is due to the Birmingham campaign, and to the readiness with which the Government challenge concerning the extension of Lord Ashbourne's Act was taken up. At any rate, the Home Rule party of both sections is in good heart, and though the day of triumph for them and for Ireland may be postponed somewhat by the new tactics of the Unionists, there is ground for increasing confidence that the next General Election will assuredly bring it within certain calculation.

Writing last month, we made an effort to expose the manœuvres upon which the Unionists were entering under the direction of Lord Hartington. We see now with more clearness what these manœuvres portend. Mr. Gladstone put the matter bluntly when he said of the Bill to keep alive the Ashbourne scheme, that it was intended to withdraw the subject of Irish Land Purchase from the cognisance of Parliament for two or three years more. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, following Mr. Gladstone, observed, indeed, that the

Government did not consider they had redeemed their pledges by the introduction of this Bill. He did not, however, say when these pledges would be taken up. As a matter of fact, the pledges of the Unionist party in regard to Ireland have been thrown to the winds. They are much more interested in the law of self-preservation than in the principles which they laid before the electors in 1886. No doubt their difficulties are great. It seems to be admitted, even by the Ministerialists—if we read aright the first night's debate on the Ashbourne Act Extension Bill—that to deal comprehensively with Land Purchase involves the prior creation of some intermediate authority to stand between the State and the tenant. And if there is less agreement as to the precise nature of this authority, it is rather because the Tories do not like to think that it must be the county board, to be brought into existence by a scheme of Local Government for Ireland, than because they see their way to substitute any other kind of authority. It is clear that once recognition were made of the absolute necessity of the county board for the proper execution of a comprehensive scheme of Land Purchase, a project of local government must be first forthcoming. Everybody is not prepared to put the cart before the horse like Mr. Chamberlain. But in any case the Government is in a dilemma. The Unionist party would not bear the strain which must arise from an attempt to deal with either question. It is a disagreeable choice to say on which horn you will sit, and the disposition to shy at both alternatives is natural if it is not very courageous. The heroic person would no doubt avoid the difficulty by promptly taking the animal by both horns. But we do not expect anything of this sort from the Salisbury-Hartington League. It does what is easiest and strikes where it may. It is to this that the mighty combination, which includes most of the great Parliamentary names of our time, and which counts a normal majority of between eighty and ninety in the House of Commons alone, is reduced. A more contemptible rôle was never assumed by a great political party.

A policy of postponing all dangerous questions is the natural resource of a feeble Government. It may, however, have a temporary success, and we may as well reckon with the fact. If it is persisted in—we fancy there may be a change—there is no very clear means of bringing the life of this Parliament to an end for three or four years. The dodge is sufficiently transparent, and indeed it is openly avowed. Lord Randolph Churchill, who not long ago insisted upon the production next year of a scheme of Local Government for Ireland, is now for filling the interval between this and the autumn of 1892 by the execution of Lord Beaconsfield's abortive programme of "sanitation." Lord Randolph finds that his chance of returning to office lies only in saying smooth things—the smoother the better—so that he has again become the humble servant of

the Government. And the First Lord of the Treasury told us the other day, when he threw over until next Session everything but the extension of Lord Ashbourne's scheme and the Employers' Liability Bill, that these rejected measures—the Tithes Bill, the Bill for constituting a Board of Agriculture, &c.—would form the programme of next session, with a *Local Government Bill for Scotland*. To digress for a moment, we may recall here the fact that this last measure was announced at Inverness last month by the Marquis of Hartington, who assumes more and more the responsibility of directing the Government. And it is of course understood that next Session will see the completion of Mr. Ritchie's famous Bill to this extent—that we shall witness the formation of the district or subordinate county authorities below the county boards now about to be elected in England and Wales. We are to have, as we said last month in this place, “a Session of rest.” And this is the prospect for a succession of years. We are ourselves no advocates for legislation for the mere sake of giving Parliament something to do. On the contrary, we have often insisted that Parliament undertakes too much. To-day, however, the case is different. Ireland can hardly afford to wait while the Unionists are composing their differences. The country is bleeding to death; and the interval may bring disaster. It is this contingency that we Liberals, who are also Home Rulers, have to face. There are ways and means of compelling Parliament to do its duty. At any rate, there are ways and means by which the defaulters can be brought face to face with certain punishment. And if we cannot achieve the first, we ought to see to it that there shall be no escape from the second.

The passing of the Ashbourne Act Extension Bill will not help the Government over-much. It will please their Irish henchmen—and the Duke of Abercorn is no doubt well satisfied with his brother's colleagues in the Cabinet. To sell now when the English Treasury offers gold, is clearly better than to run the risk of payment in the bonds of Mr. Chamberlain's Land Bank. And of course Ulster will again appropriate the vast proportion of the funds allotted to the scheme. Details as to the distribution of the previous five millions given to Ashbourne's Act are still wanted, but it is clear that so far Ulster has made about five applications to one from Connaught, and that the actual advances have been immensely out of proportion as between the two provinces. The result is to show that purchase, so far as it has gone under the Act, has not relieved the districts where the pressure is greatest. Mr. Gladstone's alternative, on the other hand, would relieve these districts. It is probable, as Lord Hartington says, that the cutting of arrears on the plan followed under the Scotch Crofters' Act, would not go to the extent of the concessions made by extremely generous landlords. Unfortunately these extremely generous persons are not found in Ireland

in larger degree than elsewhere, and what we want is that there shall be some equitable dealing with arrears apart from the kindly disposition or otherwise of the landowners. In the majority of cases the wiping out of one-third or one-half of the arrears would be a substantial relief. It cannot be too strongly insisted that since the Crofters' Act was passed, the Irish have been absolutely entitled to this relief. We take it that this is an indisputable proposition. What then is the sense of postponing the dealing with arrears, which would mitigate immediately the conditions that tell against good government, in order to continue an admittedly temporary and ineffective scheme of Land Purchase, the effect of which must of necessity only show itself after a long interval? Only a "Liberal" of the *genre* of Mr. Goschen could answer this question. It ought, perhaps, to be said that the Government do not absolutely refuse to deal with arrears. They have renewed their offer of Mr. Chamberlain's plan, but although challenged to carry it out, they do not seem to be keen on it. The responsibility of withholding a boon, which is admittedly much desired and is pregnant with great possibilities, must accordingly rest with the Unionist party.

As to the policy of Lord Ashbourne's Act itself much might be said. It is clearly full of dangers to the English Treasury, and Mr. Dillon has not failed to give us warning. But we must leave the examination of these and other matters for another occasion. It is some consolation to find that the determination of the Government to keep alive the Ashbourne Act has killed, for this year at any rate, Lord Salisbury's very obnoxious Tithes Bills. Nothing else in the way of legislation can be attempted until next Session. If the Employers' Liability Bill gets through, it will be by the goodwill and active assistance of the Opposition, who are much more friendly to it than their opponents who introduced it. As to the Excise Bill, which would give life to the Wheel and Van Tax, it is doomed in advance. Mr. Goschen has struggled gamely enough to save his child, but his Tory friends are very much divided upon this subject; and it is understood that after a sham fight on the second reading, the clauses referring to the tax will be carefully eliminated from the Bill. Thus will the Chancellor of the Exchequer save his character with "the country party," and at the same time preserve his own self-esteem. One other thing seems to issue from the Autumn sitting so far as it has gone. The Government have no present intention to disturb the compromise on the Education Question. The Vice-President of the Council, though he declared that he spoke for himself, was so emphatic in reprobating the suspicion that the Government were in league with those of the Education Commission who signed the majority report, that it is not too much to suppose he was "inspired." Clearly the Government cannot adopt certain of the leading recommendations of the majority of the Commission

without offending Mr. Chamberlain and his family. And this is perhaps enough to keep Ministers out of a palpable blunder.

The Birmingham campaign has been so much discussed that it is hardly possible to say anything new concerning it. It had from first to last an overwhelming success. We speak, of course, of the personal aspect of it. Nobody doubts that there are Unionists in Birmingham, yet they hardly made themselves known during Mr. Gladstone's visit, although the right hon. gentleman was brought face to face with 18,000 persons in Bingley Hall. It was the same in his frequent passages through the streets, and especially in the now famous drive through "the Black Country." Everywhere the Liberal leader found an enthusiastic welcome. We are quite ready to admit that this may not prove more than that the Unionists of the Midlands behaved as gentlemen. But we certainly look for political results of the highest importance as the fruit of the visit. The good seed has been sown by the master hand, and from the way in which it was absorbed there is reason to think that it did not all fall on stony places. It is perhaps as well that Mr. Gladstone followed instead of preceded the municipal elections, or we might have been told that the failure of the Gladstonian candidates on that occasion was directly traceable to the presence of the right hon. gentleman. The remarkable energy and vitality of the Liberal chief at 79—his birthday occurs next month—are naturally matter of much congratulation with those who look to him for great service in the future. To some people who make another calculation they, no doubt, give equal concern. And it is interesting to notice how the veteran, spite of intense preoccupations, continues to advance on the lines of popular freedom. His formal adhesion to the principle of "one man, one vote," and his allusions to the obstructive character of the Septennial Act, and to the desirableness of making arrangements which will lead to the increase of the number of working men in Parliament, are sufficient indication of "growth." Upon the great controversy of the time he said little that was new. In the course of a scathing criticism of Irish administration he hinted that we had not heard the last of the Mitchelstown massacre, and produced certain damaging photographs which have acted upon Mr. Balfour as a red rag on a bull. Lord Hartington's Ulster speeches, with the Randolphian refrain, "Ulster will fight and Ulster will be right," were examined with equal effect. It was shown how the Whigs are opposing the traditional policy of their party, and the picture of the noble Marquis as a firebrand, ready to light afresh the embers of religious animosities, led up to some thwacking blows at the pretensions of the Ulster Loyalists to control British policy in regard to Ireland. Mr. Gladstone had read the Address then to be presented in the week following to the Prime Minister and Lord Hartington by the Nonconformist

ministers of Ireland, and he made much excellent capital out of it. It was suggested in the Address that the English Nonconformists were incompetent judges in regard to Ireland, mainly because of the lack of local knowledge; but if local knowledge is to decide the question, it is clear, as Mr. Gladstone very felicitously pointed out, that the fate of Ireland is in the hands of the Nationalist majority. The pleas of the Irish Nonconformists were indeed of the nature which would restore the Protestant ascendancy, buried finally in 1868. But it is impossible to go over the great tract of ground covered by Mr. Gladstone in his various speeches. He had the advantage of finding himself at Bingley Hall surrounded by all his party lieutenants, with the possible exception of Lord Granville. Most of these gentlemen were also present at the meetings of the National Liberal Federation. It is the annual practice of this body to formulate the party programme, and at Birmingham this function was observed with uncommon fulness. To Liberals of our own type who look with suspicion upon the undue extension of party action, the number of "planks" in the latest edition of the party "platform" is almost appalling. We confess we could have spared not a few of them. One would like to know much more as to the direction in which certain questions are to be pushed, before giving them approval. For instance, we find it stated that it is necessary at the earliest possible moment to deal with the question of ground rents and of mining royalties. The Trades' Congress recently declared for the nationalization of these values, in order, forsooth, to relieve taxation. Is this the aim of the National Liberal Federation? Again, information would be welcome as to the suggested measures for the better housing of the working-classes. It is no doubt convenient not to define too soon; but, on the other hand, there is great danger in the heedless inclusion in the party programme of schemes which have not been carefully matured, and the ultimate drift of which is not fully apprehended.

The banquet at the Hôtel Métropole, at which the Nonconformist ministers of Ireland fêted the Prime Minister and Lord Hartington, was not an impressive function. There could be little sympathy between the ministers and the master of Hatfield. In most things they are at opposite poles, and Lord Salisbury could not put sufficient curb on his natural arrogance to prevent him telling his hearers that their claim to the name of Nonconformists was absurd. We were asked to believe, by the same notoriously veracious orator, that of 990 ministers of the Free Churches in Ireland, only eight are Home Rulers. Yet it was admitted that the Address offered to the guests of the evening did not contain more than 864 signatures. The balance is accounted for in the pretty suggestion that these ministers, on being asked to sign, were not opposed to the views which found expression in the Address, but shied at putting their names to a

political document. This is a little too much for our credulity, even if it were backed by the Tory Moderator of the General Assembly of Irish Presbyterians. And as to the further suggestion that the ministers who signed the Address spoke for their flocks, and that therefore there was throughout Ireland a vast amount of opinion which "looks with terror at the insanity" of Mr. Gladstone—this is the language which Lord Salisbury uses before Irish Nonconformists—the question may be put, why does not this vast amount of opinion show itself at the polls? Certainly it is not to be found in the figures recorded for the Unionist candidates who opposed the Parnellites in 1886, neither does it manifest itself in the frequent bye-elections which happen in constituencies held by the Nationalists. These are never contested, and it is consequently idle to talk of a vast body of opinion hostile to Mr. Gladstone among the scattered Protestant communities outside Ulster. The attitude of the majority of the ministers of the Free Churches of Ireland was exposed by Lord Hartington when he declared that, the Protestant ascendancy being dead, they "did not wish to establish a system of government under which the vast preponderance of power would be placed in the hands of another religious denomination—a denomination in which the priesthood exercise an enormous power, and which might have the result of re-establishing a religious ascendancy in the place of that happily terminated." Here we have the situation in a nutshell. The Moderator and his brethren are afraid of the Pope. Hence the banquet at the Hôtel Métropole. But we cannot congratulate Lord Hartington upon the attempt to show that he is no firebrand. He repeated the incitements which we heard at Belfast, and having done this he calmly put it to the Gladstonians whether the forces of the Crown were to be used for the reduction of the North. The answer can be given, but as we do not believe in the possible necessity we will also put a question: "What would Lord Hartington have done if the Anglican clergy in Ireland had risen in rebellion upon the disestablishment of their Church in 1868?" In the last case the rebels would at any rate have been fighting for something actual—the Ascendancy existed; in the other, they would fight against a mere possibility, in itself prohibited by the Imperial Parliament.

The *Times*-Parnell Commission can hardly be made matter of comment while it is sitting. So far the most important witness has been Captain O'Shea, formerly a member of Parliament, and long an intimate friend of Mr. Parnell. For reasons which were not exposed, Captain O'Shea has broken with the Irish leader, but he distinctly affirmed that there was no ground for suggesting that the latter was a party to crime. The witness gave afresh his version of the negotiations which led up to the "Kilmainham Treaty," mentioning that Mr. Parnell desired to keep Brennan in prison as being a person who was likely to affect prejudicially the efforts that were to be made to

suppress boycotting and outrages. He gave it as his opinion, too, that the famous *Times*' letters were really in the handwriting of Mr. Parnell, but he did not of course speak as an expert. One other interesting thing was revealed by the gallant captain—that Mr. Chamberlain, having received a letter from the editor of the *Times*, persuaded him to offer this evidence! Apart from this single witness, the Court has heard little going directly to the questions at issue. We have had all the horrors of "the Terror" retold by the relatives of the victims, and in one or two cases by informers. The attempt has been made to connect the branches of the Land League with the crimes committed in their several districts, but so far the connection of the accused with these crimes seems to be founded merely on the fact that they delivered speeches in advance of the outrages. The Commission promises to last many months, and already the President has given more than one hint to the *Times*' counsel to get to the more pregnant points of their case. It should be said that Mr. Davitt has, at his own request, been made a party, although the Attorney-General declares that he—the founder of the Land League—had little to do with its earlier operations.

As to affairs in Ireland, there is happily little to record. But what there is is significant. Kerry has been the most lawless of Irish counties, and in Kerry—mainly through the hostility of the Roman Catholic bishop of Killarney—the Leaguers have not had anything like a foothold. But the desire to put a stop to outrages of the more terrible sort, has led Mr. O'Brien to introduce the Plan of Campaign into Kerry. It has been put into force against Lord Kenmare, who has long been at feud with his tenantry. The police did their utmost to check Mr. O'Brien. Orders were sent from Dublin that on no account must the Plan be allowed to rear its head in Kerry. And we actually find Colonel Turner, the divisional magistrate, promising by letter that he will use his influence in the interest of a certain tenant if he will not join the combination. A more remarkable correspondence has not been read since Sir M. Hicks-Beach's letters to Lord Clanricarde were published. It is, however, understood that the great body of Lord Kenmare's tenantry have paid in their rents (less the reduction demanded) to the trustees under the Plan. Mr. J. D. Sheehan, M.P., was arrested and thrown into prison on suspicion of collecting the rents, and being liberated on bail, he was again arrested and thrown into prison for calling "Boo for Balfour." Mr. O'Kelly, M.P., whose offence was that of advising the people to ignore the "Star Chamber" Courts, had some success in his appeal, for the Chairman of Quarter Sessions not only reduced his sentence by one-half—to two months—but made him a first-class misdemeanant; and what is more important, declared that his language was frequently used by English members of Parliament without fear of prosecution. What have the Unionist Liberals to say

to this? The friends of "resolute government" have had to witness the release of Mr. W. K. Redmond, M.P., in advance of the expiration of his sentence. Mr. Redmond had lost weight, and he was released unconditionally! Of course, there have been evictions, and the death of James Dunne, a tenant of Captain Singleton, of Ardee, who died five hours after being turned out of his home, has resulted in a verdict of manslaughter against the agents of the Crown. Meantime, we hear that the difficulty of letting derelict farms is being overcome at Coolgreaney by the importation of Ulster Protestants. And, finally, let it be said that those excellent persons, the Protestant Unionist Churchmen in the Synod of the diocese of Dublin, have ejected Professor Galbraith from his position of clerical secretary to the Synod, because he happens to be a Home Ruler.

The International Labour Congress recently held in London was better and worse than might have been expected. The Continental Socialists who attended put themselves under great restraint, and there were few extravagant outbursts, while it is certain that these gentlemen must have learnt not a little of the working of our laws dealing with trade combinations, as well as of the nature and operations of the Trades Societies themselves. *Per contra*, it was again made clear that there is really no common ground of action possible to the English workman and to the foreigner. The former has already won his liberty; the latter is further from it than his English brethren were in the pre-Trades Union days. And it makes matters worse that there is between the two no great difference in intellectual status. The foreigners who assembled in Newman Street the other day were nearly all of them men of marked ability. It is natural enough that they should chafe at their condition, and especially at the legislative obstacles put in their way. It seems to us that their first duty ought to be to seek the removal of these impediments. But they want to achieve at a blow, a thing which the best of our English artisans have not yet accomplished. An eight hours' working day backed by legislative sanctions is yet to be established in free England. For ourselves, we do not wish to see it. We are for allowing all male adult labour to make its own bargain with the employer, and we fail to find the grinding tyranny of overtime which is paid for as "time and a half," and is at the option of the workman. Yet it is obvious that overtime must go before we can come to an eight hours' working day. And this is the one thing which will prevent it. We look forward with much curiosity to the *plébiscite* which is to be taken in the Spring among the English Trades Unions on this question. We cannot believe that the best of our artisans will recklessly reduce their opportunities of earning. It is idle to suppose that wages will be the same for eight hours a day as for ten hours; or that there will be the substantial pecuniary results of overtime

when overtime is not made. The Continental Socialists no doubt think differently, but they also may have a rude awakening. They have excuse for their aim in this, that their hours of work are terribly long, that their pay is proportionately much less than that of our own workmen, and that they have not tasted the sweets of "time and a half." Upon one point the Newman Street Congress took an important decision, since the resolution of sympathy passed with the German working men (who found it impossible under their laws to send delegates) distinctly commits our own artisans to a physical protest when the opportunity serves. It is innocent enough in a way, since the opportunity for action is not likely to arise; but we cannot help regretting that the English delegates did not here also refuse to vote with the foreigners. To encourage the German Socialists to a forcible attack upon the institutions of the Empire is doing them rather an ill service.

We are promised a new programme of shipbuilding for the Navy which, according to report, is to include as many as twenty fast cruisers, and to involve us in an additional expenditure of several millions annually for a series of years. As matter of course, the Naval reformers will find it all insufficient.

It is painful to have to add another to the record of undiscovered horrors recently perpetrated in the East-End of London—and one more ghastly than all those which have gone before. The police seem altogether at fault in their efforts to unravel the mystery of these crimes, though, in the circumstances, too much ought not to be expected of them.

The resignation of Sir C. Warren is not a matter over which we are disposed to rejoice. We would rather—much rather—it had been his master, the Home Secretary, since, whatever faults are to be attributed to the late Chief Commissioner, there can be no doubt that his policy was directed by those who are higher placed.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by writers of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

MISS CHAPMAN'S MARRIAGE REFORM.

A CRITICISM.

“No apology is required for an attempt in the direction of publicly ventilating a subject of supreme importance to society which has latterly engaged individual thought to a far greater extent than is commonly supposed. . . . Whatever may be the case with the mass . . . there is an increasing minority who occupy themselves increasingly with this particular problem of the evolution of marriage.”

It is because I am thoroughly convinced of the truth of these prefatory sentences in Elizabeth Rachel Chapman's “Marriage Rejection and Marriage Reform,”¹ that I call attention to some points in the article which I believe to be erroneous and dangerously misleading.

Miss Chapman divides the above “increasing minority” into two classes: first, those who have abandoned all respect for marriage; second, those who are profoundly dissatisfied with the institution as it exists at present, but who desire to purify and to reform—not to abolish it. Of both divisions, she says, that their rupture with the “traditional conceptions of the institution has its roots in a noble discontent, and is, in the main, indicative, not of anarchy and disorder, but of progress towards a higher form of monogamic union. . . . Will the deliberate verdict of the future,” she asks, “be given in favour of marriage rejection or of marriage reform?”

She belongs herself to the second class, whose position she further defines thus: “They are unalterably fixed in their resolve to allow

¹ WESTMINSTER REVIEW, September 1888.

no tampering with the principle of legal marriage—that is, with the solemn official ratification by the State of the life-choice of every man and woman whom, in the present, impulse or interest—in the future, as they trust, ever more and more Love only—have joined together.”

On my first perusal of this passage I momentarily imagined that Miss Chapman's experience had brought her a conviction, the reverse of my own, in reference to marriages formed by impulse or interest—viz., that such unions, for the most part, eventuate in love and the mutual happiness of husband and wife. Further consideration, however, showed me that she is not speaking of the future of individual cases, but of the future of the world's history; and her faith is in a series of progressive changes that will gradually diminish the number of unions formed by impulse and interest, and vastly increase those created by “Love only.”

Such a faith must be supremely pleasurable; and, recognising the writer of the article as a woman of somewhat logical mind and evolutionary doctrine, one looks eagerly and hopefully for the basis of her belief—her catalogue of such social forces as she perceives to be working, under natural law, towards this desired end. To my mind, there are an ever-increasing number of forces in society that, springing from individual sources of varied character, combine to create two main movements set in the right direction, that of discrediting and abolishing marriage that is false in favour of marriage relatively true.

First, the vast movement that daily frees woman in one direction or another from some of the innumerable disabilities entailed upon her in the process of race development from barbarism to civilisation. This movement—embracing a variety of minor movements, such as those for the higher education of woman; for her industrial training; for her economic independence, and equality with man; for her legal rights and Parliamentary enfranchisement—makes undoubtedly for alteration in the institution of marriage. It is clear that woman possessed of economic independence is relieved from any social necessity for enduring sexual dependence, and inevitably will assert her freedom by conformity to her own ideal of the sex-relation, whatever that may be; and I agree with Miss Chapman when she says the essence, the secret and kernel of our present discontent with marriage, is “a quickened allegiance to the only true sanctifier of the supreme human union—Love; it is a ripening reverence for the vivifying and ennobling spirit of the life-tie between man and woman . . . it is a fresh effort of travelling humanity away from lower forms.”

Second, there is another movement in society, embracing what ~~ever tends to direct interference with the marriage laws for the~~ purpose of giving to each partner in the union a social position as

precisely similar to the other's as natural differences permit, which makes also for the desired future when the life-choice of man and woman will be the outcome of "Love only"; and in this connection the agitation for facility of divorce seems to me a factor of stringent necessity and predominant importance. For observe, unless mistaken marriages can be rectified and the victims released from a false and hypocritical position, there are forces of reproduction, heredity, and training that must necessarily move in lines of direct opposition to our desired end—the creation of a young generation capable of spontaneously forming life-unions of ideal perfection.

"Surely nothing can be worse for the morals of children," Mrs. Lynn Lynton remarks, "than to bring them up in an atmosphere of dissension, of mutual hatred, of mutual recriminations, and disrespect between father and mother, where, too, they are forced to take sides and be partisans";¹ and I submit that, apart from the acutely vital question of inherited discordant physical, mental, and moral elements, of character, so long as homes of children answering to the above description exist in any number, we are bound to expect the continual reappearance throughout society of an anti-social, whimsical, impulsive, irrational type of humanity liable to form hasty, ill-assorted, degrading marriages; and have no right to cherish an unconditional faith in a future replete with whole-hearted and satisfactory unions.

But do I not misapprehend Miss Chapman? Can it be literally the case that her forecast is independent of an initial stage in which society will deal gently with benighted ones whose footsteps have strayed from ignorance; and will meet, in the benign attitude of redemption, their despairing appeal: "Oh! God is cruel! Why does He let us bind ourselves when we don't know—when we can't know? Why does He let the feeling grow, and cheat us into the fancy that it's the noblest and the most beautiful"?² by deliberately breaking the legal bond and restoring to an erring humanity that relative freedom which is the essential condition of growth in love and every other ennobling quality of civilised human nature?

Miss Chapman's first observation on divorce is a disparaging allusion to Mr. Herbert Spencer's views—that the marriage of the future, or whatever may be its equivalent, will not merely arise out of affection, but will cease when affection ceases. "The higher sentiments accompanying union of the sexes," says Mr. Spencer, may "be expected to develop still more," and facilities for divorce will bring about changed conditions under which divorce will be less frequently desired. If Mr. Spencer be correct, says Miss Chapman, "Love is on the high-road to being formally endowed with the birth-right of his wings," and "we are to be consoled with the reflection

¹ "The Philosophy of Marriage." *Universal Review*, September 1888.

² *The Right Honourable*. By Justin McCarthy and Mrs. Campbell Praed.

that by the time this state of things is reached, other changes will have taken place which will minimize its dangers. Ill-assorted unions, we are presumably to understand, will seldom take place; conjugal tragedies will be of less frequent occurrence; permanent marriage will be a habit, and a tender loyalty an instinct.

In strangely inconsequent fashion she adds "all this may be true," and immediately informs us that there are signs of reaction against the "divorce mania"; that the truth is being forced upon us that divorce means the relief of the few at the expense of the well-being of the many—the comfort of individuals through the "sacrifice of the State"; that it is "madness" to resort to legal remedies for ills (and apparently unhappy marriage is one) which only the gradual education of the race to nobler conceptions of its sex-relations can legitimately remove; that while this education proceeds individuals must suffer; that such is the "ineludible law of progress"; finally, she cheers us with the prospect that when men and women are accustomed to regard marriage as indissoluble the sum of misery may probably be less; that in the comparatively rare loveless unions of the superior future the few will have altruism enough to acquiesce in their personal privations rather than risk the stability of the "sacrament of marriage"; and, with profound approval, she quotes from Tolstoi, as the watchword of the future: "'Let every man have one wife and every woman one husband. No libertinage and no divorce.'"

Space does not permit, otherwise these propositions—an imposing array—would be contested one by one; but the point for us at present is that they clearly show Miss Chapman's marriage Utopia is to be reached without recourse to the expedient of divorce, without any relaxing of the pressure of a bond that ruins the lives of thousands, drives many men into libertinism, galls the neck and sours the temper of many women, and, above all, creates nurseries and forcing-houses for every unwholesome social weed—the selfish instincts, the emotions of fear and anger, the jealousy, hatred and malice that we are so eager to see the race outlive and supplant! She desires, in short, that, whatever the domestic strain, uncongenial marriage be not dissolved. Let society cherish in its bosom innumerable centres or sources of anti-social feeling, from which will spring, to permeate the new generation, discordant elements of character and conduct—a tide of forces set in the wrong direction, and capable of immensely retarding, if not altogether checking, the education, which she so complacently anticipates, of the race to nobler conceptions and higher forms of associated life.

Those of us whose thinking is evolutionary will surely recognise that on this point as opposed to Miss Chapman, Mrs. Lynn Lynton is in the right. I quote her words, endorsing them, for my own

part, as true to my experience of the present condition of things, and loyal to my ideal of a worthier and better future. "It is simple superstition which keeps a man or woman joined to . . . a hopeless drunkard, to a maniac, to a gambler. . . . When the essential meaning of marriage and the good of the family are lost, the form may well go; divorce is a better state of things than domestic unhappiness, wherein the passions have it all their own way, and the dignity of human nature is lost in the turmoil of dissension . . . honest divorce is a better state of things than judicial separation, which is a senseless and oftentimes cruel compromise . . . divorce should be given when for any cause the marriage is a distinct and insupportable failure, and the well-being of the children is at stake."¹

Returning to Miss Chapman's article, and placing "out of court," as she desires, all that tends to facilitate divorce, we again inquire what are the conditions and what the forces to which she looks for the rapid education of the race to nobler conceptions of its sex-relations, to a pure monogamy in theory and practice?

That new ideals exist and are beginning to lay hold of the public mind she perceives, and, strange to say, she candidly attributes this in great measure to authors—Mr. Pearson, Mrs. Caird, Miss Schreiner, and others—whom she classifies as "marriage rejectors," and whose method she abhors and condemns; although she fully recognises the moral worth of the authors, calling Miss Schreiner, indeed, "a writer whose moral intuitions are literally poignant in their reality and intensity; with whom justice is a passion and pity a kind of possession, and truth as the breath of life."

Now, conceding for the moment to Miss Chapman that the methods she condemns are wrong, we naturally demand what is *her* method; but the reply we gather from the article is of the vaguest—the most indefinite. It almost drives one to opine that the race's progress is to be as frankly unconditional as her own airy faith in the sublime future which it is ultimately to reach, anyhow or nohow! Our school, she seems to say, is impatient of effete laws; but the law that may chain—through life unto death—a noble man or woman to a drunkard, a maniac, a gambler, is not effete. In society's best interests, not to risk the stability of the sacrament of marriage, let there be no breaking of this bond; not even although, to society's detriment, the ~~up~~ result in children whose birthright is the strain of the drunkard, ~~the~~ maniac, the gambler.

Her school, ~~she~~ further enlightens us, feels repugnance for "obsolescent customs," such as wife-purchase, husband-purchase, the marrying for money or position; the spectacle of a poor noble presenting himself to a wealthy coal-owner or brewer, and saying to him: "Sell me your daughter or your ward, and I will sell you my

¹ "The Philosophy of Marriage:" *Universal Review*, September 1888.

title and position"; the spectacle of beautiful girls . . . crying in our market-places: "My beauty in exchange for a name or a fortune," and so on. Whether the feelings of this school are wholly confined to the upper classes does not appear; but no practical method of reform is expounded or hinted at that so much as touches the deep underlying causes—organic, economic, social—that throughout the length and breadth of the land create necessity for, and in many cases deplorably justify, commercial marriage. What she tells us, too, of youths and maidens being separated in the nursery, the schoolroom, almost from the cradle to the grave, so as to give a sense of aloofness and lead to the rash formation of "snatch" unions, is likewise only a class evil; and nothing is said of the reverse position amongst the masses—the close-pent proximity, not separation, that works havoc in social purity and renders simply impossible a standard of living compatible with ennobling and elevated sex-relations.

Miss Chapman tilts a little at what she calls "irrelevant ecclesiastical pretensions." She expresses indignation that the priest should relegate one of the "contracting parties, whose lives he is joining, to a position of acknowledged inferiority, of perpetual nonage, and of humiliating subjection." Waxing bold, she finally states, of her school, that it sternly rejects a service which in the name of God, Religion, Church, affixes the seal of sanctity to the despotic rule of the man, while it affixes the stigma of slavery for evermore on the brow of the woman. The words obedience, submission, reverence, subjection, should be banished from the marriage service.

So much, and alas! how little it seems, for collective action in the direction of reform; but a different question now arises. Is Miss Chapman individualistic in her conceptions? Does she see that, while society suffers all manner of positive ills from the low forms of marriage everywhere consummated, there is also an incalculable amount of loss—the negative form of evil—arising from failure of individuals to practically realize their own higher ideals in consequence of some one or other of the disastrous social obstacles that traverse or obstruct the path to elevation of life? Courage from within is perhaps the energizing principle to which she looks. Let those, she may think, who are children of the age, inasmuch as they have risen to the higher conception of marriage—"a noble and equal fellowship of hearts; a life-union based upon love"—strike out an independent course for themselves; not tampering with institutions that doubtlessly support the weak-kneed, but calmly ignoring them, and witnessing, in the eyes of a doubting world, to the fact that the moral fibre of a select few in this nineteenth century is equal to a free and voluntary monogamy—the holding firmly together through life unto death of beings whose union is fellowship of heart and soul.

Such action, if rightly motivated, must assuredly make for social

progress when carefully guarded from misunderstanding; and the non-legal marriage of George Eliot and George H. Lewes—a conspicuous case in point—was so guarded by the entire spirit and tone of the former's priceless work. No one who, by study of that work, gets into touch with George Eliot's inner life, could detect inconsistency between her conduct and thought. She was no rejector of marriage, neither did she “disparage the legal bond,” but she considered that the bond should represent relations that are true, not false. If A and B are outwardly united by a legal bond that is, in fact, a mere legal fiction, whilst B is inwardly united to C by that fellowship of heart which is the essential element—the very soul—of true marriage, a standard of conduct absolutely moral and not simply conventional demands readjustment in order that the outward be made conformable with the inward position. And this ethic, observe, is not founded on narrow premises, but on wide considerations of the best interests of society as a whole. A social structure to be firm, solid, pure, and elevated, must be based upon human happiness and reared in accordance with principles of truth.

But this problem of happiness is, for us, alas! often overwhelmingly complex and puzzling, by reason of individual frailty, of obsolescent custom, of the huge crop of barbarous instincts, of mean, dastardly, brutal, anti-social, anti-human feelings that we are carrying forward year by year to jar the music of our own inner lives and clog the wheels of social progress at every turn.

The A, B, C case seems simple enough. Surely truth would be magnified and the sum of human happiness increased by B and C openly uniting their lives, leaving A free to form some new tie as happy and truthful as theirs? But what if A should be a man or woman of predominant anti-social quality? One, perhaps, whose keenest enjoyment is a malicious satisfaction in thwarting the happiness of B and C? Are the latter justified, even in so extreme a case, in trampling upon A's wishes, however base? What will they accomplish, in the best interests of society and general happiness, if they act independently of the lower nature, not winning A to agreement in what is best, but exciting resentment, stirring up in his bosom malignant forces, that lay comparatively latent there, but are capable of powerful action tending to social disorder and misery?

Again, if the union of A and B—though no more than a legal fiction so far as love is concerned—has resulted in childbirth, the problem is further complicated; and it is precisely in the treatment of this element that the interests of society are most at stake, and the personal decision may trench upon the vital springs of national well-being. It by no means follows that A and B ought to keep together; but it does follow that the most pressing moral consideration in the problem, for A, B, and C alike, is in relation to

the child or children. They have to see to it that in an intricate and critical social position they act as rational beings, choosing of evils that which is the least, and minimizing to the best of their ability the offences that must needs come.

Now, is law a sure ethical guide in such questions of conduct? Alas! no. Law is primitive in origin, and often so primitive in character as to be out of all fitness to the needs of a rational, civilised race, in the midst of a complex associated life. But to overstep law is to court penalties in some form, and the suffering entailed must be subtracted from the sum of happiness likely to be attained by action independent of law. Such action requires a rare combination of personal qualities, not merely enlightenment of mind but moral fibre of the finest and strongest. When these, however, exist, and the decisive step is the deliberate outcome of ripe reason, no greater boon from a progressive ethical standpoint could be conferred on society than the spectacle of a permanent union—without outward coercion—of two noble lives making persistently for social order, purity, and happiness, and rendering patent to intelligent minds the direction which legal reform should take to lessen the burdens of life for those who follow after.

George Eliot's union with Mr. Lewes was distinctly of this order. If we use the A, B, C of our hypothetical case, the first Mrs. Lewes (A) was separated from her husband in all save the legal bond when life's chances brought C into contact with B. The gradual growth of fellowship of heart between C and B was no outrage on the happiness of A, but the legal tie between B and A could not be legally severed so as to make way for a legal bond uniting B with C. There were children of the first union, and the interests of these were conscientiously considered and admirably secured by the non-legal union of B and C. The penalty of being "cut off," as C expressed it, "from the world"—the conventional world, whose ethical standard was lower than her own—was sweetly borne. "It was never a trial to me," she says, "and I think I love none of my fellow-creatures the less for it":¹ whilst, in this courageous action as in the whole literary expression of her life, she has won the moral approbation of minds that are striving to apprehend social questions and adjust the external position to the inward needs of a progressive social morality.

That Miss Chapman's mind is one of these I am bound to believe; but on turning to her article I find, on page 375 of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, a complete travesty of facts, not plainly outspoken, but subtly and, I cannot but think, unworthily suggested.

A picture is there drawn of persons who, deeming themselves courageous pioneers, have on principle eschewed marriage; but fall a prey to doubt, to remorse, to suffering that is not the "hallowed

¹ *Life of George Eliot*, vol. ii. p. 294.

suffering of the martyr to truth"; and finally make confession of error, and pronounce their experiment a failure. In reference to this, she says: "The above may not be in every respect an accurate picture of the mental experience of the great novelist . . . but we are probably justified in inferring that, in outline . . . it represents something not far from the truth." On the contrary, it represents, when applied to the great novelist's case, something entirely false. George Eliot did not, on principle, eschew marriage; the absence of legal bond in her first marriage-union arose from an impediment to the obtaining of the legal bond; the union was no failure; she was a prey neither to doubt nor remorse, and her second marriage was in no sense a confession of error, but perfectly harmonious with her ethical principles and the previous actions of her life. What Miss Chapman reads "between the lines of the *Life*" appears simply the outcome of her own bias—a bias antagonistic to practical measures that are at variance with ordinary rule, and in favour of lofty ideals to which she airily points without revealing their tangible basis or distinctly showing the various paths of action that may gradually lead up to their realisation.

A very able and thoughtful writer has lately said: "According to Carlyle's parody, reform is not joyous, but grievous; and that far-reaching reconstruction of society which the thoughtful begin to plan and prelude, and the hasty to propose to accomplish without plan or prelude—this cannot be brought about without travail, and birth-pang, and long peril of misadventure."¹ In this classification of social reformers Miss Chapman belongs to—the hasty; and because I am in sympathy with her aspirations for marriage-reform—a future in which the life-choice of every man and woman will be that of "Love only," I strongly deprecate her being mistaken for a guide on the path of progress, or prophetic seer of the future evolution of marriage.

JANE HUME CLAPPERTON.

¹ John M. Robertson: "Christianity as a Historic Cause," in October number of *Our Corner Magazine*.

THE REVIVAL OF ENGLISH AGRICULTURE.

WHEN a nation stakes its existence upon its success in becoming, and retaining the position of, a gigantic shopkeeper, it begins to suffer under one or two disadvantages. In the first place, its citizens lose somewhat of their pristine sturdiness and independence, and are apt to regard unduly the pleasure of their customers, becoming timid, not to say servile, in their dealings with them. That is, however, but a small matter for the economist, and in the words of the philosopher of old, "belongeth not to this inquiry." Yet it may be alluded to in this place as worthy of the attention of the politician, or of the patriot. There are other consequences which strike the student of commercial economics even more forcibly. For a shopkeeper must suit the taste of his customers; he must attract them by low prices and unparalleled reductions; when attracted he must keep them from the clutches of the rival establishment; he must undersell the shop across the road; and must in very truth carry out the teaching of the wise men who told him to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. Now if he cannot do all these things he must fail; his customers will go away, and his shop will be left desolate, with much good merchandise therein which the fickle popular taste no longer regards with favourable eyes. Or even if our shopkeeper is fairly successful, there are many trying periods of depression to be undergone, and much skill and ingenuity to be wasted in efforts to make the purchaser buy that of which he has no need at a price which must mean ruin to somebody—that somebody been usually the unfortunate workman. In fact, existence depends upon ability to find out what your customers need, or, what seems much the same thing but brings disaster in the end, upon your ability to make them buy what they need not.

Such a position is that into which England seems to-day to be drifting. We boast to be the workshop of the world, and stake our economic existence upon maintaining the position, not of the best, but of the cheapest workman. But that such a position is desirable in the future interests of a nation, is a proposition that cannot be maintained with any real success. It is a position that leaves us at the mercy of the chances of Continental or American diplomacy, and

unfits us for maintaining a dignified and independent attitude amid the disputes of international politics. It is a position also which renders us as a nation peculiarly liable to those dislocations of industry, or periods of trade depression, which result, as has been recently pointed out, largely from mistaken calculations on the part of those "captains of industry" whose *raison d'être* is their ability to interpret the changing wants and requests of the great modern market, which is the civilized world itself. A failure in their calculations, a slight mistake as to how long the demand for a particular class of goods will last, or as to the number of those who demand them, results inevitably in a glut of the market, in a case of "over-production," which is as inevitably followed by a period of depression, occasionally enlivened by desperate struggles on the part of the manufacturer to sell his goods at any cost. With such a huge field as the modern international market, it is not to be wondered at that such mistakes are by no means rare. Indeed, even with all our modern inventions and appliances for gaining information, the wonder rather is, that these miscalculations do not occur more frequently. With a steady and well-established and well-understood home-market, such mistakes, though they occur, are comparatively rare. Labour can adjust itself to altered conditions more easily; can transfer itself from one portion of the home-market to another more readily, and can compensate itself in various ways. The "captain of industry" has less chance of making great mistakes; or when made he can rectify them with less loss. He can understand the complications of the commercial fabric more thoroughly, and supply with greater accuracy its various needs.

The drift of the above is evident. It is intended to show that, in attaching so much importance to her foreign trade and to her success in supplying foreign markets with the goods they are supposed to need, England has forgotten the importance of her home-trade, and the necessity of preserving it in a normal and healthy condition. "A pound of home-trade," as has been said by a high authority, "is more significant to manufacturing industry than thirty shillings or two pounds of foreign." But that our home-trade is in a normal and healthy condition few people will be prepared to maintain. Not only do we hear on all sides of long-continued, persistent depression, but we actually find the consumption of the country decreasing. In his evidence before the Commission on Industrial Depression (1885), Sir James Caird asserted that the loss in the purchasing power of the classes engaged in agriculture, or connected therewith, amounted in 1885, in a year too in which the harvest was slightly above the average, to no less than £42,800,000. And the loss in several of the preceding years must no doubt have been equal to, or even greater than, this. Now this loss in the purchasing power of a class, which not only represents and has always represented the main portion of the home-trade, but which even now, after all our manufacturing

progress, is still one of the largest industrial classes in the community, must give rise to serious considerations in the mind of an economic student. And there are other facts, which make him still more uneasy. They are statistics which are available to every one, but which very few seem to be aware of, still less to understand. Not only has the purchasing power of the agricultural classes declined considerably, but the number of their class, actually and also in proportion to the rest of the population, has considerably decreased, without any corresponding increase in the numbers of the other productive element in our population, the manufacturing class. A considerable element in our economic welfare is disappearing, and nothing appears to replace it.

Let us look back a century or so. Let us look at the population of England before the Industrial Revolution transformed so much of our smiling pastoral land into the grimy abode of never-ceasing machinery. In 1769 Arthur Young (*Northern Tour*, iv.) estimated that out of a total population of 8,500,000, the agricultural class, "farmers (whether freeholders or leaseholders), their servants and labourers," numbered no less than 2,800,000—i.e., over one-fourth of the whole population. The number of those engaged in manufactures of all kinds, he puts at 3,000,000, but as Toynbee remarks, this number is probably too high. Possibly Young may have made an error owing to the fact that, under the domestic system, agricultural and manufacturing industries were often combined in the same household. But his figures are substantially correct, and from them we see that those actually engaged in productive work formed nearly three-quarters of the whole population, while to-day, as the census of 1881 shows, the ratio of actual producers to the whole population is only that of 1 to 4.44.

Now let us see the numbers of the agricultural classes to-day. The total number of males and females engaged in agricultural and food production is only 1,337,333; not half the actual numbers so engaged a hundred years previously, while the proportion has sunk from 1 person in 4 to only 1 in 25 engaged in agriculture. The number of those engaged in textile trades, and in manufacturing clothing and articles of dress, which correspond to the manufactures spoken of by Young, is only 1,783,257; the proportion has sunk probably almost in the same ratio as in the case of agriculture. It is true that 2,718,054 of our vastly increased population are employed in other manufactures, some of which are of recent development, but even then the proportion of our manufacturing population of all kinds is only (roughly) 1 in 8, instead of 3, or at least 2, in 8, in Arthur Young's time. So it is evident that, strange as it may seem, neither our agricultural nor our manufacturing classes have increased, but have actually diminished, with our enormous increase in population. The classes that have increased the most are the dealers,

exchangers, distributors—i.e., shopkeepers; the domestic class; and the “unproductive” or “unoccupied” classes, which last now number 14,786,875 out of a population of 25,974,439.

The above figures are unsatisfactory enough, but it is to their bearing upon agricultural as related to manufacturing depression that we wish to call attention. The remedy may be left till later on. It will be advisable to connect with the figures showing the decrease of the numbers of the agricultural classes, those also which show a consequent decrease in the extent of arable land under cultivation in England. More particularly we must notice the decrease in the acreage of wheat. Going back only so far as 1870, we find that the acreage of arable land in Great Britain and Ireland was 24,075,000 acres; of permanent pasture 22,225,000 acres. Ten years later, in 1881, the proportions had varied considerably: only 22,878,000 acres were devoted to crops of grain: while 24,768,000 acres were permanent pasture, of which 14,676,000 acres were in Great Britain. In 1885, this number (in Great Britain) had risen to 15,342,478 acres; in 1886, to 15,535,000 acres; and in 1887 to 15,671,000 acres; and the process does not seem to have stopped. This conversion of arable into pasture land, of course, means less employment of labour, and helps us to understand how the numbers of the agricultural class have declined.

Now let us take the decrease in the wheat acreage. The average area under wheat in the period 1853–60 was 4,092,160 acres. It had declined to an average of 2,509,055 in the period 1884–87. Indeed, this average is higher than the agricultural returns of 1885, which give only 2,478,318 acres under wheat in Great Britain, as against 2,890,244 acres in 1879; while in 1887 we had only 2,317,324 acres under wheat.

A writer in the *Quarterly Review* for April 1887, estimates the decrease in the area under wheat at no less than 25 per cent. since 1876. In Ireland also, in 1887, the acreage of corn crops was less by 28,503 acres; the acreage of wheat having gone down 2186 acres since 1886. Naturally these figures find their echo in the accounts of our imports of wheat. From 1853–60, says Sir J. B. Lawes, in the *Times* for October 17, 1887, “nearly three-fourths of the aggregate amount of wheat consumed in the United Kingdom was of home-growth, and little more than one-fourth was derived from foreign sources.” But from 1879–86 “little more than one-third has been provided by home crops and nearly two-thirds by imports.” For instance, in 1885, though the harvest was slightly over the average, we had to import 61,498,864 cwts. of wheat and wheat flour to supply the deficiencies of our home production.

The natural and inevitable result of this decline in the acreage of arable, and especially wheat-growing, land is seen in the small number of agricultural labourers. Their number now is utterly in-

sufficient, even with the aid of machinery, to cultivate the land profitably. In England and Wales there are 27,579,000 acres of cultivated land, out of a total of 37,239,351 acres, and yet there are little more than one million labourers to these 27 millions of acres : one man to 27 acres. Even including the large proportion of pasture land, this number is totally inadequate for proper cultivation of the soil. The decline in agriculture, which threw so many labourers out of employment, reacts upon itself and makes our agriculture, deprived of the necessary labour, more unprofitable than ever.

This decline in agriculture has begun to be felt in a way hitherto unnoticed by the manufacturers. At first it mattered not. The political economists taught them that England had only to supply the world with manufactures, and the world would repay her in corn and food. The agricultural capital of the country could turn to manufactures. America and Russia and India could supply us with all the food we needed. Why should we trouble to grow it for ourselves? This reasoning was due to an overstrained deduction from the undoubtedly true principles of the free-traders. It was supposed, and to a certain extent the supposition was right, that each nation was peculiarly fitted for a certain industry : Russia and America were to grow the corn for the manufacturing countries, England was to supply the world with cotton goods, coals, and iron-ware ; Belgium to furnish woollen cloth, France to manufacture silk. Free competition, under free trade principles, would soon cause us to discover what countries were specially fitted to perform their various parts in the great scheme of international commerce. Division of labour and specialization of industry was the motto of the economists of a bygone age : we are now reaping the fruits of their teaching. The decline of agriculture has gone on unheeded, for the manufacturers hoped for everything from foreign markets, and seemed to imagine that England had a monopoly of the world's manufacturing industries. So far from having a monopoly we have only had a start, and are now being overtaken by other nations, who have naturally and quite excusably profited by our mistakes, and learned progress from our improvements. Now our manufacturers, finding that in the international market they have to compete, and compete sometimes unsuccessfully, with foreign rivals, are beginning to feel the serious loss which has befallen them in the home-market. A whole class of their customers has disappeared : their purchasing power has declined £48,000,000 in one year, and this must represent the cessation of a once important demand. The numbers of the unproductive and unemployed classes have largely increased ; the poor-rate is by no means light ; a large number of consumers are unable to purchase what is produced, and the old cry of "over-production" once more sounds plaintively in our ears. Thousands of miles of cloth produced, and no buyer to be found ; thousands of bushels of foreign wheat selling under cost price, and still no one to buy this

cheap bread. Yet all the while we have 1,347,000 paupers, ill-fed and ill-clothed, and thousands more whose daily struggle for a miserable existence among the depths of degraded humanity, is a satanic jest upon the name of life. Have the great manufacturers and captains of industry, the gigantic creators of all these unsaleable products, ever considered while they pay their workmen the lowest rate of a competitive wage, and for this pittance obtain a wealth of production before undreamed of—have they considered who after all is going to buy the goods thus produced? You may produce as cheaply as you possibly can, but of what avail are low prices to those that have no money at all? You may offer imported corn at a cost that compared with high prices of former days seems merely nominal, but when you have thus taken away their means of livelihood how are the workers to buy it? The manufacturers and theoretic economists have not heeded the decay of agriculture, and now the decline of so important a factor in our economic existence, the loss of so large a portion of the home-market, is beginning to make itself felt.

But to what, it may be asked, is this decline due? The neglect of agricultural interests by another class cannot entirely account for this falling off, though it may have aided the decay when once begun.

Some of the causes indeed are too obvious to require more than a casual mention. Such are the sudden opening of the granaries of America and Australia, combined with a succession of bad harvests that rendered imported food necessary. Influences like these were bound to cause a shock to any industry, especially to one that had felt the insidious security of Protection. But there were other causes which lie beneath the surface, and which show the influence of theories rather than of untoward facts.

There are two theories, notably, which have been insisted upon for generations by economists who have not taken the trouble to verify them by facts, though occasionally they have been known to qualify them by guarded admissions. Both theories are little better than pernicious nonsense, and possess only the merit of misguided ingenuity. I refer to Ricardo's theory of rent, and the law of diminishing returns. The former is simply absurd; the latter is based upon a misconception. To take the second theory first. "The elder Mill," says the well-known author of *Work and Wages*, "endorsed the dismal and absurd theorem of Ricardo, that the production of food was obtained only in diminishing quantities by increased labour, and his son insisted upon it with pious zeal." With equally pious zeal the present generation of economic writers support and illustrate it. I have before me a handbook of Political Economy, the latest published (May 1888), in which the writer, a young Oxford man, states the law in these words: "There is an industry in which the difficulties attending the production of raw material are very visible. They restrict, or will restrict, the supply of bread-stuff, for in agriculture each fresh application of labour and capital is attended

with ever-decreasing results. . . . Every advance in agricultural chemistry, and every economy in the organization of labour in farming, tends to diminish¹ the terrible effect of this great law. Unfortunately, however, at present these are but few in number." The writer then goes on to explain "why the effect of this has not been felt recently in England," and attributes our temporary salvation to the large imports of foreign corn. When, however, the growth of population in the corn-producing countries has caused them to reserve all their produce for home consumption, "our lot will be pitiable indeed, since, with a larger population, we shall be thrown back upon our own soil for support."

It is pernicious absurdity such as this that has caused the decay of English farming to be regarded as inevitable. It is no use, we are told, to apply fresh labour and capital to our fields, for we shall only get an ever-decreasing return. This is the nonsense talked at a time when our fields have only one man on the average to cultivate twenty-seven acres, and when good land that has gone out of cultivation is only waiting for labour and capital to make it productive. But even as it is, the yield of wheat on our diminished acreage has increased rather than diminished. As we noticed before, the wheat acreage of the United Kingdom in 1853-60, consisting of 4,092,160 acres, gave an average yield of 27·8 bushels per acre. The average yield in the period 1884-87 on 2,509,055 acres was, in good years, 29·4 bushels per acre, which, allowing for good harvests, shows an increase of from 1 to 2 bushels. But what shall we say when we come to examples of farming in which the amount of labour and capital spent upon the land would utterly astonish the theoretical economist? The farms of Mr. Paget in Nottinghamshire, and of Mr. Stansfield in the West Riding of Yorkshire, have yielded from 46 to 56 bushels per acre as an average.¹ Or again, take examples from another branch of agriculture. Under the system of "*culte maraîchère*" in France, M. Ponce has produced the most astonishing results from a piece of ground of only 2·7 acres. But then he put into it a "dose" of capital which would to the economist seem ridiculously extravagant. He spent £1136 in necessary outlay for irrigation, implements, and requisite appliances. As a result, he gets from it an annual income of £800, which, after deducting £100 for rent and taxes, and £570 (including £100 for manure) as annual working expenses, leaves him a margin of profit of £130 per annum—i.e., £48 per acre; which represents a return to capital of nearly 11½ per cent. per annum. Besides this, soil is made to such an extent that 250 cubic yards of loam have to be sold every year. (See "The Coming Reign of Plenty," in the *Nineteenth Century* for June 1888). This land is devoted to market-gardening. But that far higher results may be obtained even in wheat growing than is commonly supposed is evident from

¹ "Agriculture," in *Encycl. Britt.* (latest edition).

the fact that in Guernsey the average crop of wheat is 32 bushels per acre, and in the three years, 1845, '46, and '47, the highest averages reached were no less than 76, 80, and 72 bushels per acre respectively. In England the highest average since 1837 has only been 32 bushels, and Sir J. Caird puts the ordinary average at $26\frac{1}{2}$ bushels.

Surely it must be possible for the English farmer to do better than this. But the pernicious effect of economic absurdity has made itself felt in a reluctance to put too much capital into the land; and this, combined with another cause, the frequent payment of rent in late years out of capital, has resulted in our fields receiving utterly inadequate supplies of the necessary capital and labour. The fact is, that far from having too much capital we have too little, a fact which I have pointed out in a letter to the *Economist* of April 28, 1888, where I showed that the average capital employed in English agriculture was only between £4 and £5 per acre. My calculation coincides with the remark made by Professor Thorold Rogers recently, that "agricultural capital had fallen, ten years and more ago, to £4 or £5 an acre, when the minimum necessary was £10." Four or five pounds an acre can hardly be expected to produce adequate results. Even among the small tenantry of Flanders £8 per acre is, according to M. de Laveleye, almost the least amount with which a tenant enters upon his possession; and it is often raised to £16 before the expiration of his lease. As a result he obtains, from a soil that is so poor that wheat is not usually much grown, an average (at any rate in the Waes district) of from 32 to 36 bushels of wheat per acre.

In short, I trust that a consideration of the above facts will make it abundantly clear that so far from the law of diminishing returns operating at present in England or elsewhere, the contrary is the case, and that a fresh application of capital and labour to agriculture would result in a vastly increased productivity. We must, however, now pass on to a consideration of the harmful effect which the Ricardian theory of rent has had upon British agriculture.

Seventy years ago Ricardo propounded his famous theory of rent, wherein he stated that rent depended upon price. "As the acquisition of the means of existence becomes more difficult its price increases, and with it rents increase. Then, it is alleged, recourse is had to inferior soils, that is, to less profitable cultivation, and the tendency of rent is again upwards. The only check to this all-absorbing rent is improvement in the art of agriculture, which tends to lower rent—a statement which makes it manifest that Ricardo believed rent to be the resultant of price." Professor Rogers has been at some pains to disprove this theory, and devoted recently part of an address before the Bradford Statistical Society to its discussion. He pointed out that in the Stuart period of English history the price of wheat was on an average 41s. a quarter; the rent of some of the best arable land in England

was 3s. 6d. to 6s. per acre. The same land now pays 36s. 8d. an acre, while of course the present price of wheat is 36s. or even less per quarter. Hence rent depends evidently only in a secondary degree on the price of agricultural products. Nor again can it be shown, as a matter of fact, that farmers have ever, under pressure of scarcity, resorted to inferior lands—i.e., to land which yields less profit on outlay than land already under cultivation. For to do so would simply mean that if a man cannot make fairly productive land pay, he will waste his capital and labour on still worse land. The cultivation of apparently unproductive land must depend largely upon the agricultural advancement of the time.

Professor Thorold Rogers concludes, as the result of his unequalled investigation into the history of agriculture in England, that price has very little to do with rent, and that, as a matter of fact, it is paid out of profits. For, assuming that a farmer knows his calling—which is not invariably the case—and that he is diligent in pursuing it; that he keeps accounts, which is a rare thing, and misliketh him much, and that he has an adequate capital in tillage, which as the rule is not the case at present in England, then naturally “the rent which he can pay after all his expenses are met and his capital is unimpaired, is anything over and above the reasonable profit which he has a right to expect from his calling. It is because his skill has increased and his profits have increased with his skill, that land which 200 years ago paid only 3s. 6d. per acre now pays 38s. 6d.”

Since profit causes rents, and it is not price that causes it, rents should be lowered as profits fall. The enormous rise in rents in the last 200 years, a process which is only now being stopped, has swallowed up most of the farmers' profits, and they have had to pay the rent out of capital, a system of which the results were partially concealed by the fact that farmers have not systematically kept accounts, and which was continued owing to the loss (of 10 or 15 per cent.) involved in getting out of agricultural holdings. The landowner, too, has been aided in his attempts to obtain a continually increasing rent, by the economic dictum which assured him that “rent does not form a part of the price of agricultural produce; or, in other words, that agricultural produce would be no cheaper if all rents were remitted.”

This absurd proposition could only be conceived by economists who had not taken the trouble to understand the circumstances attending the supply of agricultural produce to this country. The proposition is proved in this way: the price of agricultural produce is determined by the margin of cultivation, and it must be such as to remunerate the capital and labour expended in tilling some of the worst land in cultivation which pays no rent. If prices were less, this land would cease to be cultivated, and the margin of cultivation

would contract. But this cannot take place because the demand for agricultural produce would not be diminished by the remission of rents, and as much produce would be required as before; and it is this demand that determines the position of the margin of cultivation. Now this reasoning is vitiated by the assumption that the supply of agricultural produce is so limited that the demand will always be sufficient to ensure a remunerative price, and that this price will always and everywhere repay the farmer. Its artificial character is manifest to any one who considers the facts. The supply of corn and agricultural produce at present exceeds the demand for it, and the farmers of America and Europe are competing to supply wheat at the lowest possible price. The vast increase of English and American population has not by any means overtaken its means of subsistence; indeed, it may safely be asserted that it will not do so for generations to come.

The demand, therefore, has not increased the price of agricultural produce, but that price has been reduced by an increased production. The result is that the British farmer, handicapped by a high rent, is unable to grow corn at the low rates of a competitive market, in which his competitors have little or no rent to pay. He, at any rate, and we suppose he ought to know something about so practical a question, always includes rent and taxes in the cost of production. In the estimates of growing wheat obtained by the *Mark Lane Express* in 1885, we observe that out of 200 returns, only a dozen put the rent at less than £1 per acre, though 37 out of the 40 English counties were represented. Several charged for rent over £2 an acre, and some much higher amounts. Rents are probably, indeed certainly, rather lower now. Title rent-charge varied from a few pence to 10s. an acre, the average being a little over 4s. Rates and taxes ranged from 1s. 2d. to 11s. in extreme instances. In short, out of a total expense of £8 10s. 9d. per acre, returned by 85 wheat-growers in eleven of the principal wheat-producing counties, rent and taxes came to £2 0s. 7d. per acre—i.e., nearly a quarter of the total working expenses, or cost of production. The land in question gave as a return £6 16s. for grain, and £1 12s. for straw; leaving a loss of 2s. 9d. per acre. It is ridiculous in this instance to tell the farmer, whose prices are kept down by a competitive market, that a reduction in rent of only 10s. per acre would not convert his loss of 2s. 9d. into a profit of 8s. 3d. per acre, and enable him to sell his produce at a lower price as a consequence. In fact, the Ricardian theory could only hold good at all in the case of an absolutely limited quantity of land suitable for cultivation, combined with a population that was pressing on its means of subsistence. Neither of these conditions operate to-day.

We have now passed in review, and briefly criticized, some of the causes that have combined to create the present depression of agricul-

ture. We have found them to be undue exaggeration of the importance of foreign markets in the manufacturing industries, and a consequent neglect of the great home industry of agriculture, and the market it affords; the effect of a strong and suddenly developed foreign competition, which has lessened the profits of farmers, who were handicapped by a high rent; the continued increase of rent for 200 years, due largely to crude conceptions of economic theorists as regards the origin of rent and its effects upon prices; lastly, the want of sufficient labour and capital to properly cultivate the soil, a state of things due, to some extent, to a misconception of the law of diminishing returns. To these we must add, it is feared, the carelessness of the British farmer in not keeping accounts, and thereby not knowing whether he is working at a profit or a loss. Also, the want of energy and resource shown in times of crisis in turning from one rural industry to another. The tendency of both the farmer and his landlord is to cry out for Protection, in the hope that a rise in price would mean a rise in profits. The hope is fallacious, and the request is discreditable.

We now come to the remedy proposed for the relief of this depression, which, with Sir J. Caird and other authorities, we take to be a recall of capital and labour to agriculture, both in wheat-growing and in other branches. But before doing so, it may be well to consider whether such a revival of agriculture is possible, or even worth while, under the present circumstances, having before us so great a foreign competition.

We believe that it is not only possible, but likely to be extremely successful. So far I have not said much about foreign competition, though I put it among one of the chief causes of our present depression, because there is good reason to believe that it cannot last much longer in its present extreme form. And if the rivalry of foreigners can be shown to be in any way declining, the prospects of the English farmer must be proportionately encouraging. Such, we believe with Mr. Bear, to be the case. In a paper read by him before the Farmers' Club, January 30, 1888, Mr. Bear called attention to the loss at which the American farmer was at present producing corn. Prince Kropotkin and "Stepniak" say that the Russian peasant will not continue much longer to sell corn to foreigners, and live for half the year "on bark and auroch-grass, mixed with a handful of flour, and called bread." Besides which statements, statistics tell us that the wheat acreage of those countries which export so much grain is surely and steadily decreasing—a sign that wheat at present prices does not pay.

The facts on this head are admirably stated in an article in the *Quarterly Review* for April 1887, to which I am much indebted. Up to 1880, and less uniformly up till 1883, the wheat acreage of the world had been increasing enormously. In the ten years ending

with 1880, the area in America had risen from rather below 19,000,000 acres to nearly 38,000,000 acres. In Australia, in the ten years ending 1884, there was an increase of over 2,000,000. The acreage under wheat in India was in 1886 over 27,000,000 acres, an increase probably of one-fourth since 1874. But lately the acreage under wheat has everywhere been much reduced, as the following table will show. It gives the acreage, and the average yield per acre in bushels, from 1880 to 1886.

	Average acreage up to 1880.	Acreage.			Increase or Decrease.	Yield per Acre in Bushels.
		1884	1885	1886		
UNITED STATES.	37,988,000	39,475,885	34,189,000 Under	37,000,000	Decrease	12·4
RUSSIA	29,000,000	—	30,000,000	29,000,000?	Decreasing	8 to 9 10 good
AUSTRALASIA—						
New South Wales	—	289,757	275,249	264,887	Decrease	
Victoria . . .	—	1,104,392	1,096,354	1,020,082	"	12·5
South Australi	—	1,816,151	1,942,153	1,830,000	"	7·0
Queensland .	—	10,742	15,942	13,289	"	
West Australia	—	28,768	29,416	29,511	Increase	
Tasmania . .	—	41,301	34,091	30,286	Decrease	
New Zealand	—	377,706	270,042	173,891	"	26·5
Total.	—	3,698,817	3,663,548	3,161,016	DECREASE	
CANADA (Ontario and Manitoba).	2,000,000	1,893,407	2,042,028	1,844,114	Decrease	{ 18·2 Ontario 19·7 Manitoba
INDIA	—	—	—	27,000,000	Slight Increase	9·4 or 10
Value of export of wheat, 1882-3 .	600·9 lacs	—	887·8	800·2	Decrease	

The above figures show that, except in India where there is a slight increase, the acreage of wheat is decreasing throughout all wheat-exporting countries. This is due to the general depression of agriculture, which is being severely felt. It is becoming evident that wheat cannot be grown at the prices of the last two or three years. Many of the American farmers are bankrupt, or their holdings are heavily mortgaged. In a letter to *Bradstreets'*, April 7, 1888, Mr. W. E. Bear quotes from the *Chicago Tribune* an estimate of farm mortgages in the ten Western States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri:—"According to this moderate careful estimate, the farm mortgages in the ten Western States mentioned, amount to the tremendous sum of over 1200 million dollars, and the interest-charge cannot be less than 90 million dollars per annum. . . . The farmers of the West can never get free from under the load that oppresses them without help. Under present conditions it is preposterous to suppose that they can even meet their mortgages and free their lands. They are virtually to-day only tenants on their own farms, and with the prospects of becoming so in name as well as in fact, in the near future." Another Chicago journal of November 30, 1886, says the same: "Wheat at the prices that prevail in the States

west of the Mississippi River, is grown at a loss." Statements such as these are but confirmations of the undeniable evidence of statistics.

As for Russian agriculture, it is indeed in a pitiable state. The accounts of the depression and misery of the peasants given by Prince Kropotkin and "Stepniak," are confirmed even by official reports. M. Vischnegradski, Minister of Finance, in presenting the Budget for 1886, admits, in spite of its comparatively favourable nature, that agriculture is suffering; and the Comptroller of the Empire explains the increasing diminution of the revenue from alcohol by the increasing penury of the lower classes, consequent upon agricultural and other depression. Indeed, the wretchedness of Russian agriculture is shown by the low average yield (8 to 9 bushels) per acre.

Everywhere, then, except perhaps in India, we see signs that the present competition in wheat-growing cannot last, and that in this respect, at least, the British farmer has good ground for hope in the future. There is another fact also which is of good omen. English manufacturers are beginning to lose ground in foreign markets, and will have to pay more attention to home industries, and realize that "one pound of home-trade is better than thirty shillings or two pounds of foreign." This may cause more attention to be paid to agricultural affairs, and promote assistance in the way of useful legislation to remove some of the many obstacles to a free agricultural industry. It is unnecessary here to go into details showing the growth of home manufactures in European countries, and the consequent decrease of trade with England. Our manufacturers know the figures well enough. In this place we need only refer to the facts given by Prince Kropotkin in the *Nineteenth Century* for April 1888, showing the growth of manufactures in Russia and Germany; in India likewise, and even Spain and Brazil. The cry of our manufacturers against French and German competition in open markets is too familiar to be repeated.

We see, then, that two important tendencies are at work in the economic world at present. On the one hand we have a distinct decrease in the wheat-growing area of those countries which chiefly export corn; on the other hand, a sure and steady growth of home manufacturing industries in countries that formerly were England's customers. We even find them entering into competition with ourselves. It seems certain, therefore, that any effort made in the direction of recalling capital and labour to agriculture is likely, if properly directed, to meet with success. But the process may probably take some time. Capital does not flow like water, though metaphysical economists talk as if it did. To be assured of success, capital must also be assured of security.

This brings us to the first of the reforms needed to facilitate the

revival of our agricultural industries. There must be complete security for the tenant's capital. This has indeed been partially secured by the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883, which allowed tenants compensation for their improvements; but it is still possible for a landlord who does not mind paying the compensation to demand an exorbitant rise of rent from a tenant on the expiration of his lease, or else to turn him out of his farm. What is needed is nothing less than entire security for tenants' capital: for it is folly to expect a man to invest capital in a tenure of which he is uncertain. Such security may be gained by granting continuity of tenure, with free sale of the tenant's interest in the holding (the landlord having a right to pre-emption), and, as connected therewith, a reform in the laws affecting the transfer of land from one tenant to another is necessary. An illustration may be seen from the fact that, as is well known, farmers often suffer severe loss from their inability to get out of their holdings or to transfer land without losing a large percentage of their capital. Sir James Caird puts the loss at 15 per cent. Professor Thorold Rogers puts it at 10 per cent. Whichever it may be, it is heavy enough to frequently induce tenants to submit to an extortionate rise in rent, rather than lose so much of their capital. "Dispossession, if the tenant has £5000 worth of capital, means a minimum loss of £500, or, according to Sir James Caird, of £750. A rise of 2s. 6d. an acre on a 500-acre farm is £62 10s. a year. The evil does not seem so great as dispossession"—and so the farmer stays on; and often pays his rent out of capital.

There are other rights which a tenant ought indubitably to possess. He should be allowed to get as much return from the land as he can, and in the manner in which he thinks he will best succeed; that is, he should be allowed perfect freedom for attempts at agricultural improvement. Again, he should be free from vexatious restrictions as to cropping, sale of straw, and so forth. "The liberty to sell straw," says the writer of "Competition in Wheat Growing," in the *Quarterly Review* of April 1887, "is an important element in the question of the ability of British farmers to meet foreign competition in the production of wheat." But it is not my purpose here to go into the question of Land Law Reform. It has been dealt with fully by those qualified to form an exact and authoritative opinion, and lies at the root of any permanent amelioration of English agriculture.

The question that will most largely affect the revival of agriculture in England is undoubtedly that of the introduction of a considerable class of small tenants or proprietors. The Allotments Act of 1887 has introduced the thin edge of the wedge, but it is so far that and nothing more. The provision that one person may not hold more than one acre is an unnecessary limitation; and the restriction that "no building other than a tool-house, shed, greenhouse, fowl-house, or pig-sty is to be erected thereon," is simply vexatious. The Act

does, however, provide for compensation for tenants' improvements; which is a step in the right direction. But what is needed is a much larger revival and extension of the system of small holdings, as a step towards the desirable result of the association of agricultural skill with competent capital. Such a system has naturally encountered opposition from landlords, because their traditions have always favoured large farm tenants, and a system of *grande culture* which, till the present crisis, was apparently successful. But even ancient traditions must not stand in the way of experiments for the good of the nation. And if experience in other countries shows that a system of *petite culture* and small holdings produces desirable results, the experiment is at least worth trying on a large scale.

The primary, and indeed the most serious, objection to this system is the alleged insufficiency of capital which is said to accompany it. But though the individual capital of peasant holders is small, the proportionate capital is large. "I am sure," says Professor Rogers, "that if intelligent labourers had the prospect of getting a ten or fifteen-acre farm, with a decent dwelling and corresponding farm offices, the amount of capital per acre with which they would stock their holdings would soon be relatively far higher than that of the large farmer, and that the produce per acre would be far larger, especially if they betook themselves to dairy-farming and ensilage, as the small fifty-acre farmers in the Eastern States of America are doing, and with such marked success, upon the worst land in the world." This is a statement from one of our highest authorities. It may be confirmed and illustrated from the facts observed in the case of small tenants in other countries. And in any case, as has been previously shown, the amount of agricultural capital in English agriculture at present is so small that an objection, even if well founded, to small holders on account of their not possessing a sufficient quantity of it, merely places them on a level with their larger neighbours. But let us look abroad.

Belgium, as is well known, possesses in proportion to its population a very large number of small farmers. Out of a total of 348,700 holdings no less than 220,000 are farms of about 8 acres as an average; 63,000 holdings average about 10 acres each; 61,700 average about 40 acres; while only 4000 are about 160 acres in extent. As to capital, let us take the information given by M. de Laveleye. He tells us that in Flanders—where the medium size of holdings is $7\frac{1}{2}$ in the West, and only 5 acres in the East province—a small tenant, though perhaps having a capital of only £8 per acre on starting, often raises it to £16 before the expiration of his lease. As a result, the *average* yield of wheat is from 32 to 36 bushels per acre and often higher, and that too in a soil so poor that wheat is not grown to any extent. There

is surely no reason why a similar state of things should not obtain in England.

It will, indeed, be noticed that small holdings often get a better return from the soil than do large farms. The reason, doubtless, is that even if in some cases there is not so much capital there is far more labour, and that of a better and more devoted type. It is easy to give examples of astonishingly favourable results from small holdings. We have seen the case in Flanders. The case in Jersey and Guernsey, where small farms of sixteen acres are common, is similar: 40 bushels per acre of wheat being the average in Jersey, 32 bushels in Guernsey; and even 70 or 80 bushels. In evidence before the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes (1884), the Rev. C. W. Stubbs repeated a statement previously made, that 40 bushels of corn per acre is a very common allotment crop. On allotments at Granborough, he said, land cultivated by labourers produced 60 per cent more wheat than the farmer's average, and 11 per cent. more than the average of the highest scientific farming. Lord Carrington has stated that on his estate in Buckinghamshire, his 800 allotment tenants obtain a net produce from the land of £40 per acre: the farmer's average return from the same land is £7 per acre. In France, the results of *petite culture* are still more wonderful. The almost incredible returns obtained by market-gardeners around Paris have recently been detailed in the *Nineteenth Century* (June 1888) alluded to above. The best test of the extent of productiveness obtained by them is seen in the fact that they pay the enormous rent of £32 per acre for their holdings. Their lot, it is true, is not enviable; but it is due to other causes than the fertility of the soil.

The example of these market-gardeners of Paris brings us to another point in the question of the extension of *petite culture* in English farming. It is extremely desirable that market-gardening and fruit-farming should be extended in this country. No system is better adapted to this kind of production than that of small holdings. And it is pleasing to note that already orchards and market-gardens are being more and more cultivated. In 1886 there were 200,284 acres of orchards; in 1887, 202,234 acres, a slight increase; market-gardens covered 60,850 acres in 1886, and 62,666 acres in 1887. But fruit-farming is not so forward as one could wish, although, considering the vastly increased consumption of fruit of late years, an extension of this industry would be most desirable. The area devoted to it in 1886-7 was only 202,234 acres; a small increase of 32,118 acres since 1873. But while the tenant is not allowed to plant fruit trees without the consent of his landlord, and even then can claim no compensation, it is not to be wondered at that fruit-farming does not progress. The law must first be amended in this respect. Railway charges might also be lowered, as they are often so heavy as to prevent the grower from sending his fruit to market at

all. Every facility should be given to this industry, which is most profitable to a small tenant, the produce per acre being on an average £40, while the working expenses are only £20 on the average. Indeed, strawberries yield a gross return of about £60, or even as high as £100 per acre.

Another most important branch of agriculture, peculiarly suitable to an allotment, or small holding system, is dairy-farming, which might certainly be developed to a far greater extent in England. It is surely unnecessary that we should import annually £3,080,561 worth of eggs from France, Belgium, and Germany: that France, Holland, and Denmark should send us £11,886,717 worth of butter: that America and Holland should supply £4,508,937 worth of cheese; and that we should get as much as £721,000 worth of poultry and rabbits from Belgium and France. We could produce for ourselves a far larger quantity of these products than we do at present, especially in the way of eggs, poultry, and rabbits. It is due largely to ignorance that dairy-farming is not more productive in England. Mr. Bolton King, in speaking on "The Labourer and the Land," declared that owing to the ignorance of the labourers' wives as to the working of a dairy, the men were often unable profitably to keep a cow upon their allotments. A wider diffusion of knowledge in this respect is evidently much needed among the agricultural classes. But little or no knowledge is required to keep fowls and to rear rabbits, and very much might be done in this direction if the importance of, and profitable return from, this branch of industry were pointed out to the owners of small holdings. There is a great demand, and it is as easy, and indeed easier, for English labourers to supply it than it can be for foreign peasants to do so.

Such are some of the improvements that might be instituted simultaneously with an extension of the allotment, small holding, and *petite culture* system in British agriculture. But here one word of caution is needed. Do not let the labourer's profits be unnecessarily taxed by the middleman. Before all things, a more economical system of bringing the producer and consumer together is imperative. The waste and loss incurred in the process of distributing the commodities produced has lately been frequently pointed out, and it would be out of place to dwell much upon it here. The success of co-operative distribution has shown how large a margin of middlemen's profits may be encroached upon; and it is to be hoped that this example will not be wasted in the future. There is a great field for the friends of the labouring man, in showing him how he may sell his produce and buy his necessaries with the maximum of profit and the minimum of waste.

Last, and most important of all, comes the question of rent. We have seen how high rents have pressed upon the British farmer, and how they influence the cost of his production. Even with the most

profitable return from the soil £2 per acre, not an uncommon average, is a great tax. Rents must be greatly reduced. "If wheat growing is to pay," says a high authority, "rents should be below rather than above £1 per acre." Sir James Caird also declares that rents must be re-arranged. Landowners have indeed been compelled to re-arrange them, often at a reduction of from 10 to 20 per cent. Perhaps a time will come when the nation will be glad for its citizens to till the ground and supply the English people with food, without making them pay for the privilege of doing so. It is not the purpose of the writer to enter into any discussion as to the justice of rent, or the extortions of the middlemen. But this much any one can see who has given attention to present economic problems—that the cost of distribution and rent have become a serious burden to the producers of our ordinary necessities of life. These two questions are foremost in pressing for immediate solution. One of them, the question of distribution, is now being solved by the leaders of the Co-operative movement. The other is as yet in process of agitation, and those who read the signs of the times see plainly enough whither that agitation is tending. Both must be dealt with effectually, in one way or another, if the agricultural remedies proposed in this essay are to have a genuine success.

But there are other questions that press in upon us as we think of the problems of the day, and that cannot be solved solely by the aid of economic science. Our social order is in a transition period, and the end has not come yet. Perhaps before the transition is complete, men will have learned that the highest ideal of national prosperity is not to out-do their rivals in supplying far-off foreign customers with goods which it is doubtful whether they really want, and which they can often make just as well for themselves; that a nation's true wealth consists in men and not in miles of cloth, or tons of iron, or millions of money; and that for a natural and healthy economic existence, a prosperous, independent, and self-supporting agricultural class, living on the labour of their own hands and the gifts of a well-cultivated soil is necessary as a balance to an equally prosperous manufacturing population.

H. DE B. GIBBINS.

ANGLOPHOBIA IN THE UNITED STATES :

SOME LIGHT ON THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

THE Presidential campaign can scarcely be said to have begun in earnest until August. In that month I landed in New York, and as I did not leave the United States till October 31—six days before the election—my stay in the country may be said to have practically covered the whole of the campaign. This would not, of course, avail much if I had passed the time in mere sight-seeing or pleasure-seeking ; but when I state that I spent every waking hour in hard work—reading, observing, interviewing, thinking, collecting and collating facts—I think it will be admitted that I may, without presumption, claim to know something of American politics.

When I left this country two eminent Americans, Mr. Hurlburt and Mr. Smalley, were engaged in a warm controversy on the disposition which was being manifested towards England by the Republican party and its Irish allies. Mr. Hurlburt, who was formerly editor of the *New York World*, and is therefore able to speak with authority, maintained that Mr. Blaine and the American Republicans were, so far as Free Trade was concerned, engaged “in a campaign of sedulous and systematic misrepresentation,” and that they were striving to win the Irish vote “by openly declaring that their own policy was a policy of hostility to England, tending and intending to develop an irreconcilable antagonism between America and English interests, and to foment mischief between the United States and the British Empire.” Mr. Smalley, who is the London correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, and also (strange as it may seem) a sympathetic and active friend of the Tory party, affected to be very much shocked by Mr. Hurlburt’s serious charges, and indignantly demanded evidence in support of them. Whether Mr. Hurlburt supplied the evidence or not I do not know, but I promise Mr. Smalley that he will get evidence enough if he reads this article, and I venture to assert that his contention that the animosity of the American Irish towards England has recently softened into friendliness will, in the face of the facts that I shall present, be seen to be ridiculous. As the Republicans have now triumphed, and triumphed chiefly by the unscrupulous use of the very means which Mr. Hurlburt exposed and condemned three

months ago, and as their accession to power will, in my judgment, inevitably tend to embitter the relations existing between Great Britain and the United States, the discussion of the matter is no longer of merely academic interest, but is invested with grave importance.

When I arrived in New York last August I found Uncle Sam in an uncommonly bad temper. He was suffering from an acute attack of his old disease (which now, I fear, bids fair to become chronic)—Anglophobia. I knew something of the old gentleman's idiosyncrasy, and what acerbity of disposition he could manifest where Great Britain was concerned, and I had solemnly vowed that I would not rouse his ire by expressing any opinion on American politics. Nevertheless, I was hardly prepared to find my Yankee relative raging so furiously against the beautiful little island which I love so patriotically, and which he regards with such ineffable contempt. Before I went to America I was under the impression that an Englishman might always count on a warm welcome from his American cousins. Reluctantly, but surely, I have been compelled to change my opinion. The hostility which is cherished towards England by Americans, and which manifests itself in such irrational ways, especially during a Presidential election, was a revelation to me, as painful as it was surprising. One phrase which was constantly on the lips of political speakers, and constantly recurring in the newspapers, was "It's English, you know." This sneer was far more effective than argument, as it appealed at once to the selfishness and to the prejudice of the people. One of the campaign songs which the Republicans sang in their meetings with great gusto is entitled "It's British, you know." Here is the last verse and the chorus :

"It's too long a story they wants all to tell,
From Britain, you know, Great Britain, you know,
When in London it rains, here they raise their umbrell,
That's British, so British, you know.
American toilers, what do you say?
Are you ready to cast all your birthright away
'To convicts and paupers who toil without pay?
You're Yankee, not British, you know."

(Chorus.) "It's Free Trade they preach, and it's Free Trade they teach,
That's British, you know; quite British, you know.
They'll never take anything out of their reach,
That's British, so British, you know."

The animus of this is obvious, but it is by no means the worst sample that can be found. Did space permit it, I could quote verses even more mendacious and offensive. Probably there is no nation on the earth towards which Americans use such indecent and insulting language, and use it seemingly with delight, as they use towards the English. I suppose it is another illustration of the law that the closer the kinship the more fierce and ruthless the quarrel.

Well, "It's American, you know," for Uncle Sam to pour his grain and fruit and meat into our free and untaxed market; to send his sons to compete with our boys on the exchange and in the counting-house, and his daughters to become the rivals of our girls in the drawing-room and the social circle; to exult with honest pride whenever they achieve success at our expense; and then, the moment an Englishman presumes to offer an opinion on American affairs, to shriek that we want to interfere in his politics and whiningly complain that we cherish in our hearts the malignant design of destroying his industries. I decidedly prefer to be "English, you know;" it is so much more rational and dignified. "Is Common Sense British?" asked the *New York Times* on September 25. I unhesitatingly answered the question in the affirmative, and I could not help wishing that the Americans had a little more of this British commodity. It would have saved them from such deplorable exhibitions of folly as they have presented to the world during the past few months.

No man has done so much to foster this anti-English feeling in America, and fan it into a flame, as Mr. James G. Blaine, whose disposition towards this country is apparently of the most malignant character. I say apparently, for I do not know that it is really so, and for the reason that Mr. Blaine is incapable of sincerity in his political hates and loves. He knows what will please his countrymen and win votes, and this, whatever it is, he uses without scruple, simply because he always has an eye to the main chance. In this election the best card he could play was to misrepresent England by attributing to her evil designs upon American commerce, and so he played this card, not so much because he hates England as because he wished the Republicans to be victorious. He would to-morrow, if votes could be won by it, turn round and declare with tears that he loves England as the apple of his eye, and that Free Trade would prove an unmixed blessing to America. Mr. Blaine and his party have won, and as they won chiefly by making false representations as to the effects of Free Trade in England, and as to the designs of England on American commerce, their victory conclusively proves that a majority of American electors are, to put it in the mildest form, not friendly towards this country.

The burden of Mr. Blaine's speeches was that England, who had long been on the look-out for an opportunity to capture the American markets, now thought her hour was come; that she wished to secure a revival of trade, and could find no other way so effectual as gaining free access to "65,000,000 of the most intelligent people on the globe as purchasers and consumers;" that she had found a pliant tool for the accomplishment of her ends in President Cleveland, who had

become a traitor to his country; that if England succeeded in forcing Free Trade upon the American people, they might bid farewell to their prosperity; that Free Trade, even if it did not close the factories and workshops, would reduce the wages of the work-people by fully one-half; that the working men and women of England, under Free Trade, and *in consequence* of it, were all on the verge of pauperism; and that Free Trade, if introduced into the United States, would similarly degrade the American working man, now the best paid, the best fed, the best housed, and altogether the most noble fellow, in the world. This was about the substance of Mr Blaine's speeches. Did space admit of it, I could give quotations from his addresses on every one of these points, and it would be equally easy to prove that he is as much in error when he speaks of the prosperity of the American workman as when he depicts the miseries of the working classes of England. All this, however, must be reserved for another occasion. What I am anxious to make clear now is that Mr. Blaine's chief stock-in-trade as a Republican electioneering agent was abuse and misrepresentation of England. He appealed to the passions, the prejudices, the most sordid qualities of American electors; he touched no question without degrading it; a more shameless display of grovelling selfishness was never presented to the world by any man making pretensions to statesmanship. One extract from Mr. Blaine's speech in New York, immediately after he had landed from Europe, may be given in proof of what has been said :—

“There is one question from Land's End to John o' Groat's, from the Irish Sea to the English Channel, in every paper, from one end of the Kingdom to the other, there is one unanimous accord on the part of Tories and Whigs, of Liberals, and Conservatives and Radicals, and that is, that the Hon. Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, embodies in his person the change, the form of revenue, the Free Trade which they like. . . . If you will agree to live in as poor houses, and eat as poor food, and receive as low wages as the operatives in England, you can produce just as cheap goods as the Democratic Administration want you to. . . . Put your labouring men into competition with the labouring men of Great Britain, and in course of time you will make them as poor.”¹

Littleness is the one word which best describes the predominant qualities of American politicians and American politics—unless the word meanness be preferred. What, for example, are we to think of a gentleman like Mr. Chauncey Depew, a prominent Republican, who was talked of as a candidate for the Presidency, when he intimates that Mr. Blaine made a mistake in returning to America on an English ship, and congratulates himself that he preferred a German vessel? The obvious inference is, that Germans are less disliked in America than the English. Senator Kenna, a Democrat,

¹ Speech in Madison Square, August 10.

said in a speech : " While Harrison is hidden in his feed-box in the interior, the great decoy-duck of the party (Blaine) comes here in an English-built ship with the American name *City of New York*." This remark was received with hisses—the hisses evidently being meant for Blaine. The " Home and Country Protection Brotherhood of Working Men," whose " National Headquarters " were at 45, Willoughby Street, Brooklyn, announced a series of meetings in the *Brooklyn Eagle* in the following fashion :—

" ENGLAND AGAINST AMERICA.

" The people of every country constitute an industrial world of their own creation. Freedom within and Protection without. This is our industrial world of America and not of England. We know our rights and shall maintain them. Protection and prosperity, education and liberty."

These, however, are but small matters, too contemptible for serious mention were it not that they are fairly representative of thousands of other incidents which took place in every American town ; and these, taken in the aggregate, go far to determine what the feelings of the Americans towards the English really are. It is as true of nations as of individuals that little things reveal their characters better than great ones.

The discussion of the relations between Canada and the United States afforded the politicians and journalists of the latter country a fine opportunity of indulging in that highly popular pastime known as " twisting the British Lion's tail," and some of them used it to the full. When I had been in New York a little over a week (September 8), a debate took place in Congress on the Retaliation Bill, the ostensible object of which was to protect the interests of American fishermen against violence and outrage at the hands of the Canadians. Mr. Wilson, of Minnesota, the author of the Bill, said, in concluding his speech : " Should the Queen of England and the Empress of India, forgetting the lessons to her ancestors in the past, aim or discharge at us one unfriendly gun from one of her gunboats, I predict that the echo which it would awaken would not cease to reverberate before Grover Cleveland, President of the greatest Republic on earth, would salute Charles Stewart Parnell as the President of the youngest Republic on earth." This remark was received with applause, not from the Republican but from the Democratic side of the House. Mr. O'Neill, of Missouri, taking advantage of some foolish remarks of the London *Standard*, in which the United States were warned that the guns of England were behind Canada, said that there was no nation that the Tory party would be less liable to trifle with than America ; and he added : " It knew that if trouble should come England would need all her ironclads to take care of the British Channel. It would bluster and it would bluff, and it would

back square down. There would be no war. No fear of that. A war with America would mean a loss of India to England, and the verification of the prophecy of Thomas Davis, that England's difficulty would be Ireland's opportunity." Whereat there was more applause, apparently on both sides of the House. Mr. McAdoo, in the same debate, said that "England's modern ironclads would be as impotent in our harbours as washtubs armed with fire-crackers," and he "warned Lord Salisbury that the first British gun fired against New York or Boston would assure the destruction of the British empire."

It will probably be said that these gentlemen, though members of Congress, are merely fire-eating politicians, whose utterances have no weight in the country, and that this Yankee spread-eagleism should be treated with the silent contempt which alone it deserves. Very good. The same can hardly be said, however, of Mr. Whitney, the Secretary of the Navy, who was boasting that the United States could "whip England," and declaring that they have "Navy enough to destroy her shipping, ingenuity enough to protect their sea-board, and men enough to capture Canada." Mr. Whitney also stated that within a week of war being declared, Canada would be in the hands of the United States. It is not surprising that such indiscreet and provocative utterances as these, coming from a Cabinet Minister, caused great resentment in Canada. Yet Mr. Whitney stands high in the estimation of his countrymen—probably all the higher on account of the silly remarks which I have quoted.

The recent history of the fisheries dispute between Canada and the United States, forms a very curious episode in American politics; it throws a good deal of light upon the ways of American politicians, and it certainly reflects no credit upon President Cleveland. The facts are simple, and may be stated in a word or two. With a view of bringing about a settlement of this outstanding dispute between Canada and the United States, President Cleveland proposed that a treaty should be framed; he appointed commissioners to frame it, who acted under his inspiration and guidance; and England, on behalf of her great American Dependency, appointed Mr. Chamberlain to represent British interests. The treaty was made, and Mr. Cleveland expressed his emphatic approval of it; his opinion was endorsed by his Administration; but the Republican Senate, actuated by partisan motives, refused to confirm the treaty, and reproached the President for truckling to Great Britain and yielding to the demands of Canada. Stung by this reproach, which, especially on the eve of the Presidential election, was likely to injure him in the eyes of his countrymen, Mr. Cleveland turned a somersault and sent to Congress the Message in which he demanded power to retaliate on Canada. It was not Canada that rejected the treaty; it was not Great Britain; it was

the American Senate: but Mr. Cleveland, instead of dealing with this contumacious branch of his own Government, turns his back upon his own former proposals of conciliation, and thus introduces new elements into the controversy, which set up a dangerous friction between the two nations. And this course was taken by Mr. Cleveland, not because he thought it was just or statesmanlike, but because, being a candidate for re-election, he could not afford to have his *prestige* lowered in the eyes of his countrymen, even by adhering to a policy which was honourable in itself, and which, therefore, in the end, could have brought nothing but honour to its author.

This unexpected and inconsistent action on the part of the President naturally provoked a good deal of unfavourable criticism in this country. Sir Charles Tupper, exercising remarkable self-restraint, contented himself by calling Mr. Cleveland's message "extraordinary." The Duke of Rutland, though a Cabinet Minister, used greater frankness, and characterized the message as "bluster." He was right. Mr. Cleveland, for partisan purposes, was simply trying to convince the American electors that he could outdo Mr. Blaine himself in Jingo spread-eagleism. The Press of this country, so far as I was able to study its utterances at such a distance from home, was unanimous in its disapproval of the President's tactics, and for once, at all events, the Press probably gave expression to the thoughts of the British people. But the American Press was almost as unanimous in its approval of the President's course, and I think it as faithfully represented the feelings of the Americans.

The *New York Tribune* (Republican) found fault indeed with Mr. Cleveland, not because he retaliated at last, but because he was conciliatory at first. The *Tribune* would have given Canada a short shrift. Here are its words:—

"The question was one of outrageous conduct on the part of an English dependency, not of Treaty misinterpretation on the part of the English Foreign Office. There was no dispute over the meaning of cloudy words. It concerned only the behaviour of a British colony, and its acts of wanton violence upon the persons and property of American fishermen. Mr. Cleveland understood the question, for his Secretary of State expressed it with admirable clearness. Had they thereupon assumed a firm and resolute position, which the Republican Senate so stoutly urged upon them; had they then with becoming dignity formulated the National demand together with an expression of the alternative of non-intercourse to which its denial would force us, we should not now be cutting in the eyes of the world the humiliating figure of a people whose Executive cringes and fawns and blusters by turns."¹

This may be taken as the Republican view: Canada was wholly in the wrong; no discussion should have been held with her, as all conciliatory means had been exhausted; the only sensible and self-

¹ *New York Tribune*, September 8, 1888.

respecting course that the United States could take was to tell Canada that unless she made apology and restitution war would at once be declared upon her, which would virtually mean that she was to be wrested from England and annexed to the States. The Democratic view was very similar. The *New York Herald*¹ said :

"There is no hostility whatever in the Message. It is simply a demand for fair play, such as England herself would make under similar circumstances. There is no chip on Cleveland's shoulder; neither has he any intention of surrendering our well-known rights. The administration means peace, but peace with honour (what a familiar Jingo sound there is in this!). . . . Mr. Cleveland has shown the people of this country that while he is too busy to talk buncombe about being an American, he is quite ready to show by his public policy that he is one. . . . Our British cousins are somewhat startled by the bold stand which Mr. Cleveland has taken."

'The *New York Sun*,² edited by Mr. Charles A. Dana, extravagantly eulogized President Cleveland for throwing over the policy of his treaty, and taking up the policy of the Republican Senate. "Mr. Cleveland has sat upon his fishery statesmanship of the past like a little man, and lo! he has bloomed out into a full-blown American patriot, sturdily echoing the cry raised by his fellow-citizens in 1887, and which but a little while ago it seemed had been given to the winds, never to sound again. And how sweet to the American ear the echo is!" Then Mr. Dana proceeds to lecture the British people on their "brag," and he does it in the following characteristically modest style:—

"Every effort would be made in the event of a war with Great Britain to prevent the approach of ironclads by means of torpedo boats and submarine mines. But should such precautions fail, and should the English wantonly bombard and burn our commercial metropolis, as they burned Washington in the war of 1812, they would arouse in the whole American people a spirit and a capacity of revenge that would be satisfied with nothing short of the ruin of the British Empire. Neither should we want for allies; for, in a contest with ourselves, we do not believe that England would have a single friend upon the Continent. Assuredly she could not look for assistance in her hour of need to Russia or France; no, nor to Germany, that would like nothing better than to see her shrivelled to the dimensions of a third-rate Power. Lord Salisbury knows that the first collision with the United States would sound the death-knell of British Government in Ireland. The American Revolution evoked Grattan's Parliament, but the next war with this country will involve the absolute independence of the Emerald Isle. The single army corps which it was recently computed would represent the largest military force which Great Britain could dispose of for aggressive purposes, might be furnished with plenty of employment near home, and might not get further than Queenstown on its way across the Atlantic."

When I read this savage outburst I was attending a religious Convention. I read the article over one night to a company

¹ August 28th.

² September 5, 1888.

assembled at the house of my host. There were present men and women, both young and old, all connected with the Christian Church, but not one of them expressed disapproval of the sentiments of the article, while many of them seemed to think those sentiments were wholly admirable. I was surprised to find that even Christian ministers contemplated without regret, some of them apparently with satisfaction, the prospect of a war between the two countries over the Canadian Fisheries Question. The Jingo ravings of James G. Blaine had influenced them far more than the precepts of Jesus Christ.

Evidently American journalists do not read each other's papers, for three days after Mr. Dana's fiery editorial appeared, the *New York Times* coolly remarked: "All the bluster that we have seen any sign of has come either from the other side of the Canada line, or the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. From those quarters *alone* have there been threats and bellicose talk and references to guns and ironclads." The *Times*, which is perhaps the most able and impartial journal in America—certainly in New York—wholly approved of the President's retaliation Message. It said: "In sending his Message to Congress, under the partisan provocation of the Senate's unfair action, he was no doubt actuated in part by a desire to vindicate his courage and his Americanism, but he did it in a way to command admiration, by his dignity and his high sense of justice." It was an electioneering move, but it was a dignified one! As if it ever could be dignified for America's chief magistrate to allow himself to be provoked into stultifying himself for no worthier object than to win votes. The *Times* proceeds:

"Nobody in this country desires or talks about any breach of peaceable relations growing out of these questions, much less do we consider them a cause for immediate or ultimate hostilities with Canada or Great Britain. We simply demand what is obviously right and fair, and if we do not get it we propose to treat Canada as we are treated. Simply that and nothing more, and on that point the Government and the people are united, regardless of any consideration of domestic politics. . . . Sixty millions of people are not to be scared by war talk from Great Britain or any other Power on the round globe. Our sea-coast cities might be laid under contribution by Great Britain in case hot-headed fools egged on a conflict, and any such conflict would be for us tremendously costly, but there would be one retribution and indemnity as sure as fate. It would carry the dominion of the United States to the Arctic Ocean."

As this Canadian question is still unsettled, I have thought it well to treat of it somewhat fully, in order that the feelings of the American people in relation to it may be clearly understood.

It would be impossible, in the space at my disposal, to enumerate the falsehoods with regard to England which were circulated broadcast during the election, or to comprehensively treat of the mendacity of the Republican press, and I must therefore be content to notice only

one or two of the most flagrant examples. In passing, I may say that lying and forgery are regarded as perfectly legitimate weapons of warfare in American politics. Both parties use them, and their use excites no horror or even disapprobation, as there is no conscience against them. When they are found out their authors suffer no loss of standing or character; the whole thing is simply laughed off. At present, however, I am dealing only with the lies and forgeries which were manufactured in relation to England, and truth compels me to say that these came almost exclusively from the Republican party.

A great stir was made by the Republicans early in September over some "revelations" which were made by a Mr. Nathaniel McKay as to the effects of Free Trade on the working classes of England. This gentleman is said by the *New York Press* to be an "eminent shipbuilder"—which alone is sufficient to explain his hatred of Free Trade; for England, owing to her Free Trade, has been able to wrest all America's shipping business out of her hands; and Mr. McKay, owing to Protection, is probably able to charge his countrymen almost anything he likes for making ships. Moreover, Mr. McKay had a dispute with President Cleveland, in which he got decidedly the worst of it. On the fourth of last April the President vetoed a Bill, entitled "An Act for the Relief of Nathaniel McKay and the Executors of Donald McKay," and it was after this action on the part of the President, that Mr. McKay began to consider what he could do to prevent Mr. Cleveland's re-election. He decided to go to England and investigate the condition of the wage-workers there—a very commendable thing to do if he would only have been content to speak the simple truth about it afterwards, but unfortunately, he was not. The history of the vetoed Bill is this. Over twenty years ago Mr. McKay's firm built for the American Government two ironclad monitors, called the *Squando* and the *Nauset*, and a side-wheel steamer called the *Ashuelot*. The contracts provided that the Government "should have the privilege of making alterations and additions to the plans and specifications at any time during the progress of the work, as it may deem necessary and proper," and that if these alterations caused extra expense to the contractors the Government would "pay for the same at fair and reasonable rates." The contract price for the *Nauset* was \$386,000 and for alteration \$192,110 more were paid. The *Squando* was to cost \$395,000, and \$194,525 more were paid for alterations. For alterations in the *Ashuelot* \$22,415 were paid. The contractors received these sums in settlement of their claims, and gave receipts in full to the Government; while an opportunity was subsequently given to them to make further claims of which they failed to avail themselves. President Cleveland dealt with the matter very fully in his veto Message, and said, among other things, this:

"In 1867 the claims were fully examined under a law of Congress and rejected, and the Supreme Court, in an exactly similar case, finds neither law nor equity supporting them. It hardly seems fair to the Government to permit these claims to be presented after a lapse of twenty-three years since a settlement in full was made and receipts were given, after the opportunity which has been offered for establishing further claims, if they existed, and when, as a consequence of the contractors neglect, the Government would labour under great disadvantages in its defence. I am of the opinion, in view of the history of these claims and the suspicion naturally excited as to their merit, that no injustice will be done if they are laid at rest instead of being given new life and vigour in the Court of Claims."

Mr. McKay's claims, and the hopes which he had built upon them, were "laid at rest;" but he did not rest, he came to England instead. On his return to America he published sensational, highly exaggerated, almost hysterical accounts of the miserable condition of the working classes here. On September 6 he was interviewed by the *New York Tribune*, and he spoke of the "destitution, squalor, and wretchedness of the British working-classes," and of "the villanous extortion and the shameless oppression that are practised by the employers of Christian England towards those whom they employ," all of which he declares to be due to Free Trade. "The degradation of women, and a cruelty towards helpless children that should make the 'stones weep,' are also concomitants of that hideous fetish, Free Trade, as such a policy has resulted in Great Britain, or rather in the manufacturing districts of that kingdom." On Sunday, September 16, the *Press* of New York published an address from Mr. McKay to the working men of America. Here are some of its headlines: "The Terrible Struggle for Bread all through Great Britain;" "Hunger and Squalor Everywhere;" "An Appalling Picture of English Homes under the Policy of Free Trade;" "Happiness almost Unknown amid the Grinding Struggle for Existence." The article was illustrated by a "Scene in the Black Country," which never existed except in Mr. McKay's imagination, and by pictures of women at work on coal-pit banks and at the forge. Mr. McKay states that he visited the coal-pits and cotton factories of Wigan, the chain-makers of Cradley Heath, the London Docks, and various other places; and he gives what purports to be a true description of the condition of the working-people employed. As a matter of fact, his statements are in the main untrue, those referring to the working-classes of Manchester, Liverpool, and Wigan being ridiculously false; while those relating to other places are so absurdly overdrawn as to be utterly unworthy of credence. Here is a specimen of Mr. McKay's unimpeachable veracity and judicial impartiality:

"Human beings can be forced to no lower depths of degradation and despair than I witnessed in the land we call 'Merrie England,' as a consequence of its economic policy, and it is with the earnest hope that our great and prosperous country shall not be turned into a land of paupers,

starving working-men and ruined industries, that I address you. If Free Trade is to be our policy, it will not be long before the misery and suffering at present among the English toilers will be stalking through this land too."

He concludes thus:—

"On August 23 I stepped aboard the steamship bound for America—the land where, thanks to Protection, Progress, and Enterprise [not Protection alone, then?], *the sun never shines on such things as I had witnessed in my short stay in the land of Free Trade.* Never did a weary traveller turn his footsteps toward his native land with such joyous feelings as did I after having journeyed through more misery, destitution, and poverty *than was ever shackled on honest labour in my own land.* It was a sight, Mr. President Cleveland, which, if you could have spared the time from your shrievalty duties at Buffalo to witness, you never would have written that Message to Congress which must for ever be your condemnation in the eyes of every wage-earner who looks for meat on his table more than once a week, clothes on his children, and a school-house for them instead of a factory, and a decent home for his wife instead of a place at a chain-maker's forge."

That Mr. McKay found distress and misery among our working classes I do not deny; that he found things one-half as bad as he represents them to be I do deny absolutely; and that the evil conditions which prevail among our industrial classes are due to Free Trade is a theory so flatly opposed to all the facts of the case that it could not be entertained for a moment except where interest or prejudice had blinded the reason or where passion had produced partial insanity. I am prepared to take the worst that even Mr. McKay has said about English working-people, exaggerated as it is, and to find in the United States, that blessed paradise of Protection, what will not only parallel, but surpass, it in every feature of oppression and degradation; for I have facts at my command which will confound any Republican Protectionist who is audacious enough to imitate Mr. McKay. A Mr. A. Bronchemite, of 98, Victoria Road, Widnes, wrote to the *New York Tribune* to say that he accompanied Mr. McKay on his tour of investigation, and that *he dare not show him the worst.* It would be interesting to know who Mr. A. Bronchemite is.

The Republicans eagerly seized upon Mr. McKay's unctuous cant about the curse of Free Trade in England and the blessings of Protection in America, and made extensive use of it as electioneering material. His descriptions of the women who work on coal-pit banks and in chain- and nail-making forges, with photographs of them at work, were heavily drawn upon. Pathetic articles appeared in the papers on the "terrible story," which was "a true picture of industrial life in Free-Trade England." Heaven was piously invoked to "forbid that the wives of American mechanics should ever be compelled to don men's clothes and labour as these wretched women do." Every good American woman was exhorted to read these true

stories of industrial life in England, and examine the photographs of Great Britain's female slaves. The American people were told that "the squalor of such cities as Liverpool, Sheffield, Leeds, Manchester, Glasgow, and some parts of Birmingham, is terrible. The crowded houses, the cellars reeking in filth, and single rooms where human beings sleep, eat, multiply and die. And remember that the native population live in these horrible haunts—the skilled workmen."¹ The Republican National Committee reproduced Mr. McKay's photographs of the pit and forge women on cards, and scattered them broadcast by the hundred thousand. I received several of them at the great meeting which was addressed by Mr. Blaine in the Polo Grounds, New York. On these cards the Union Jack, surmounted by the British crown, appeared in connection with the Democratic nominations for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, and underneath were given quotations, genuine or forged, from English newspapers. These quotations were mostly forged, and it was somewhat significant that in no single case was the date given. The two forged quotations which were most largely used purported to be from the *Spectator* and the *Times*, and ran as follows: "Grover Cleveland has done more to advance the cause of Free Trade than any Prime Minister of England has ever done;" and "The only time England can use an Irishman is when he emigrates to America and votes for Free Trade." The spuriousness of these "extracts" was exposed over and over again, but they were used all the same, and others added to them. One of the other "quotations," alleged to be from the *Times*, is this:

"When the Celt has crossed the Atlantic he begins, for the first time in his life, to consume the manufactures of this country (England), and indirectly to contribute to its customs (revenue). We may possibly live to see the day when the chief product of Ireland will be cattle, and English and Scotch the majority of her population. The nine or ten million of Irish who, by that time, will have settled in the United States cannot be less friendly to England, and will certainly be much better customers to her than they are now."

I have taken no pains to ascertain whether this is a forgery or not, for its character is evident on its very face. Underneath appeared the words: "Irishmen. Englishmen expect every man of you to do your duty, and vote for British Free Trade." The *New York Times*, referring to these forgeries, said:

"It is not likely that there has been any parallel in our history to the baseness of the tactics to which the Republican party has descended, and which seems to constitute its only method of party warfare. . . . It is very melancholy that a once great party should see no hope for itself but in the success of a confidence game on the credulity of the American people."

How the Republican editors and bosses who were circulating these forgeries and lies must have laughed in their sleeves at the credulity

¹ *New York Press*, September 16, 1888.

and ignorance of their dupes ! For they knew all the time that Republican employers of labour, who were contributing large sums of money to this campaign of mendacity, were also employing women under conditions which degraded and unsexed them to a degree that is unknown in Wigan or Cradley Heath. The average American elector is appallingly ignorant upon the very matters which he ought to understand in order to be able to vote intelligently, and this ignorance is dense and impenetrable to an extent which is perfectly amazing. None know this so well as the voracious professional politicians who prey upon him. Never, probably, in the world's history were so many professedly enlightened people gulled and fooled at any one time as in the United States during the recent Presidential campaign.

I had hoped to be able to illustrate somewhat more copiously than I have done, by extracts from Republican literature, the tactics which were resorted to by the Republican Party in order to utilize for their own ends the Anglophobia which prevails in the United States, but the mass of such material on my hands is so vast that I must perforce, from considerations of space, reserve it for treatment on a future occasion. Within the limits of this paper I can only deal with two more points—viz., the attitude of the American-Irish, and the Sackville incident.

While in New York I saw Mr. Patrick Ford, who endeavoured to convince me that Free Trade was the prime cause of all the wars in which England has been engaged since the repeal of the Corn Laws, and that if the United States adopted Free Trade they, too, would find themselves involved in wars all over the world. A wilder theory was never propounded. Mr. Ford, and those who work with him, formed an "Anti-Cleveland and Protective League," and this body (whether it was large or small, I know not) displayed a good deal of activity, and seemed to be provided with ample funds from the Republican Treasury. There was also an Irish "Anti-Free Trade League." Whenever Mr. Blaine visited New York Mr. Patrick Ford was closeted with him. They drove together in the same carriage when Mr. Blaine addressed a meeting in the Polo Grounds, and on several other occasions they were together under circumstances which indicated that they were on very intimate terms. Mr. Ford was the prime mover in the organization of the mass meeting of "Blaine Irishmen," which was held at Madison Square Garden on October 25, and which I attended. The whole tone of this gathering towards England was intensely bitter. Here are two of the mottoes which were displayed: "Every Irishman who votes for Free Trade is a practical ally of England;" "I have claimed for Ireland's Parliament power to protect Ireland's industries."—CHARLES STEWART PARNELL. In the address which was read to the meeting, and signed "Patrick Ford," the following sentiments were expressed: "We are

here to-night not as Irishmen to consult for the interests of Ireland, but as Americans to discuss American affairs with American ends in view ;" "The great leader of the Irish people, as a practical man, has openly declared for Protection. Parnell demands an Irish Parliament, not a Parliament in name but in reality. He demands an Irish Parliament that will have power to foster and protect Irish labour, and make Ireland industrially independent of England and all foreign nations. With Parnell all that is national in Ireland is in hearty agreement ;" "With the sentiment of filial affection that we cherish for our motherland, and of loyal, unswerving devotion to the land of our adoption, there issues also a sentiment of undying hostility to that evil power which is called England, and which has been the traditional enemy of both Ireland and America. The assaults of this evil power upon our independence and prosperity, although changed in method, is persistent and unceasing [I quote verbatim]. Through her mouthpiece, the *London Times*, England has served notice that she 'intends to break down the Protective system in the United States and substitute the British system.' To that English declaration of war the American people will respond on the 6th of November next."

Patrick Egan was the first speaker, but he spoke in dumb show, and was finally howled down. But he had previously stated his views on the blighting effects of Free Trade in Ireland, through the columns of the *New York Tribune*. In this article he says that the "Free Trade for which the Irish Parliament so enthusiastically and so determinedly contended was not the 'Free Trade' of the Cobden Club, but *freedom to trade!*" The thesis which he endeavours to prove is that Free Trade has been the curse and ruin of Ireland : "It was in order to take away the power to protect Irish industries and to establish Free Trade between England and Ireland in the interest of English manufacturers, that Pitt worked out the accursed Union, the cause of all the degradation and misery and heartburnings of the Irish people for the last eighty-eight years ;" and "the English people are just what the French contemptuously call them, 'a nation of shopkeepers,' and, pursue English policy where you will around the globe, you will find it, in every clime and in every instance, moved and directed by some commercial interest, dear to the heart of the English shopkeeper, and worked out by chicanery. So it was, and is, in England's relations to Ireland." Mr. Egan also tells us in this article that, three years ago, Mr. Parnell "claimed that the Home Rule Bill, then about to be formulated for Ireland, should give to Ireland the right to protect Irish manufactures—at least for a limited period—but so great was the alarm aroused among the English 'shopkeepers' and the Liberal Cobden Club Free Traders, that he has not dared to say one word more on the subject ;" and then he adds : "In Ireland my country-

men are struggling for protection for Irish labour, protection for Irish manufactures and commerce, protection for Irish homes ; while Irish landlords, English monopolists, and Cobden Club theorists, want Free Trade in Irish eviction, Free Trade in Irish land, Free Trade in Irish labour, and a free market for English manufactures in Ireland." Mr. Egan's speech in Madison Square Garden, so far as I read it (for it was perfectly inaudible) was in the same strain.

Mr. Blaine's speech was as bitter towards England as those of his Irish intimates. It was audible to the majority present, and was delivered with animation ; but to call Mr. Blaine an orator would be an exaggerated compliment. In this country he would rank as a third-rate speaker. Of genius there was not a single trace in this twenty minutes' address, nor in any of the addresses which he delivered during the campaign, all of which I read. After Mr. Blaine's speech, Mr. Lewis Barker, of Maine, said that England had "got to take her hands from the throats of Irishmen, who are going to keep her out of the United States by voting for Benjamin Harrison ;" and Judge Brennan, of Iowa, said : "We are going to make it a fair stand-up fight between England and America, and show that as Irishmen and Irish Americans we will not let England destroy the industries of this country as she did those of Ireland."

The *New York Times*, commenting upon this meeting, said that, although decent Republicans had often had to blush for their party, it was "doubtful whether any one thing had happened that was better calculated to disgust such Republicans than the meeting of 'Blaine Irishmen' at Madison Square Garden, which James E. Blaine addressed, and over which Pat Ford presided." It further characterized the meeting as

"the culmination in this city of this disgraceful attempt to debauch American politics into a sequel of Irish grievances. We have looked over the list, a column long, of the Vice-Presidents of the meeting, the men who are put forward at every public meeting as the most presentable members of the party to which they belong. The list may contain the names of some obscure but respectable citizens. It certainly contains the names of many malefactors and blackguards who disgrace the Irish name. All the names in it that are known to us are known by disrepute. Inspector Byrnes is probably the most competent person in New York to analyze this list. It is sufficient to say of it that it does not contain the name of a single one of the residents of this city of Irish birth or parentage who have done honour to their race in the public, professional, business, or social life of New York. . . . Is there any American who can consider without disgust this meeting of dynamiters, presided over by a collector of 'emergency funds,' and exhorted by an American politician who has been Secretary of State and the candidate of his party for the Presidency, to shape their political action, as if Americans had nothing else to do in the world but to hate England?"¹

This journal further expressed the opinion that the meeting would

¹ *New York Times*, October 26, 1888.

prove a boomerang in the hands of its Republican promoters, and that such a meeting and such a speech would "repel more patriotic and self-respecting voters than it would attract voters of the class to which its constitution and its proceedings appealed." Therein the *Times* has proved to be in the wrong, for this meeting is believed to have had a good deal to do with the carrying of New York by the Republicans. Notwithstanding the character of the promoters of this meeting, Mr. Blaine not only patronized it in the most ostentatious manner, but General Harrison sent a telegram, in which he congratulated Ford & Co. upon the "magnificent impulse their intelligent zeal had given to the cause of Protection in this campaign." The General is incapable of a joke, or one might think that this was "rote sarcastic."

There is much food for reflection in what has been said about the American-Irish, especially for Liberal Home Rulers. As a friend of Ireland, a Radical, and a Home Ruler of the most pronounced type; as one who, both as a political lecturer and a Radical candidate for Parliament, has advocated self-government for Ireland, I am prepared to say that if the Irish tail in the United States is to wag the Parnellite dog in this country; if Liberal Free Traders are to be placed in the same category as Irish evictors and landlords, and covered with scorn and obloquy by the very men whom they are striving to help; then we shall have to reconsider our position. And if the English Liberals and the Irish Nationalists again become estranged, the latter may bid farewell to all hope of obtaining Home Rule during the present century.

The Sackville incident played a large part in the meeting on which I have been commenting. Lord Sackville's letter had been published a day or two before, and copies of it, printed on cardboard and in bold type, and surmounted by the Royal arms, were distributed broadcast through the meeting. Mr. Blaine, who had probably known all about the letter for six or eight weeks, seized upon the subject with avidity, and used it in such a way as to make it as offensive as possible to England, in order to win the support of his Irish hearers: "Three Ministers to the United States, certainly two, have had their walking papers for an offence less grave than that. . . . I tell you this was done to bring the whole British vote to Mr. Cleveland's support. . . . Are we to have a British Minister telling Americans what they shall do in their national contests?"

Though I was in America when this incident occurred, and diligently read all that was published respecting it, I have never been able to get to the bottom of the matter. Who "Mr. Murchison" (the writer of the letter to Lord Sackville) is I do not know to this day. It has been stated that he is a *bond fide* resident of Pomona, California, whence the letter was dated; but in support of

this no satisfactory evidence has been adduced. As far as my information goes at present, "Mr. Murchison" is the reporter of a Republican paper at Los Angeles. This is the belief in Pomona itself, and a *New York Herald* reporter, who sought "Charles F. Murchison" in Pomona, was unable to discover any such person. The probability is, therefore, that the whole thing was a "put-up job," that a trick was played on Lord Sackville, and if this be so it is about the dirtiest piece of business that has been exposed to the world for many a long year.

The treatment of this incident by Americans of all parties was a gross breach of international courtesy, to say nothing of neighbourly good-will. "Bounce Sackville," "Sackville Sacked," "Good-bye to Sackville," were among the headlines that appeared in the papers. People assembled to see the Atlantic steamers sail for England would shout to the passengers, "Have you seen Sackville?" and think it a good joke. Every feature of the matter was marked by bad breeding, and the worst of it was that the Americans prided themselves on their bad manners. Lord Sackville was even sneered at for imagining that any injunction of privacy would be respected in the United States, or, in other words, for supposing that in writing to an American correspondent he was dealing with a gentleman. It turns out that he did make a mistake in cherishing such a belief, but it was a very creditable one. Surely it is adding insult to injury to divulge a man's private communication, and then laugh at him for being such a fool as to believe in your honour! The American newspaper press, as a whole, is not at its best calculated to command the admiration of an educated Englishman, but probably it never showed to such little advantage as in its treatment of this Sackville incident. The *Cincinnati Commercial Gazette* (edited by Murat Halstead, I believe, a Republican leader) printed a portrait of Lord Sackville and a picture of the British crown, and followed them with no less than nineteen headlines, which can only be compared to the shrieks of a woman suffering from hysteria. The *New York Herald* (Democratic) was not much better. The *Tribune* (Republican) followed suit, and stigmatized Lord Sackville as a "British Election Agent." Even the usually (comparatively) sober *Times* turned giddy. Every American journal not only condemned Lord Sackville, but did it in a style which conveyed the impression that they wished to be as offensive as possible to England. But not one of them, so far as I saw, uttered a word in condemnation of the action of the man who published a letter marked "Private." Apparently this is quite compatible with the American code of honour.

President Cleveland and Secretary Bayard are quite as deserving of censure as the journalists. They made representations on the subject to the British Government, but before our Government had time to take action, they, with indecent haste, decided to give the

British Minister at Washington his passports. The manner and motive of doing this were even more objectionable than the thing itself. On October the 27th, the day after Ford's meeting, and almost before Lord Salisbury had received Secretary Bayard's telegrams, President Cleveland assured two Boston Irishmen, John Boyle O'Reilly and General Patrick Collins, who were closeted with him in Secretary Whitney's house, that he would hold no further intercourse with Lord Sackville and had decided upon his dismissal. And of course Mr. Cleveland permitted himself to act in this discreditable way from the pitiful motive of trying to win the Irish vote. Moreover, Mr. Phelps, when he first laid the views of his Government before Lord Salisbury, stated that little importance was attached to Lord Sackville's letter, but he laid great stress upon what the Minister had said in an interview. Lord Salisbury very naturally asked for a report of the Minister's utterances, and Mr. Phelps promised to obtain one; but before he had time to do this he received a notification that the President and his Cabinet had peremptorily closed the incident by giving Lord Sackville his passports. Yet even the most moderate and fair-minded of the Americans contend that President Cleveland acted with forbearance and dignity! It seems hopeless to expect rational conduct from Americans where England is concerned.

Even in this country it is the fashion for everybody to blame Lord Sackville; but I for one am not ashamed to say that I think him wholly free from blame in this matter. Lord Salisbury is undoubtedly right in his contention that the British Minister had the right, in his private capacity, to express his private opinion on the political affairs of the country to which he was accredited. This is all that he did. To say that he interfered in American politics is utter nonsense. What he did was to write a private letter as an English gentleman, to a correspondent whom he mistakenly supposed to be a gentleman also. The publication of his letter was obviously against his wish, and was a gross breach of faith and honour. Lord Sackville has been very scurvily treated from first to last, and by all parties. He was first made the victim of a political adventurer; then he was insultingly dismissed by the American Government from partisan motives; the British Government tamely permitted him to be thus sacrificed; and his countrymen withheld from him their sympathy.

When I arrived home on November 9, I found that the Sackville incident was attracting a good deal of attention. On the evening of that day, at the Guildhall banquet, Lord Salisbury referred to the subject in a bantering tone. He said: "Events have taken place which belong, I think, rather to the history of electioneering than to the history of 'diplomacy.'" And he added: "I think I am entitled

to say, after what took place on Tuesday, that the statesmen who rule in Washington have not commended themselves to the approval of the people of the United States." Now, if this had any point at all, it meant that the American electors had preferred Harrison to Cleveland because the latter had, for electioneering purposes, displayed indecent haste in giving Lord Sackville his passports. Yet the result of the election really tells quite in the opposite direction. The letter was drawn from Lord Sackville by a Republican trick; it was used by the Republicans as a campaign document; and a majority of the American people, by electing Harrison, have shown that they approve of these Republican tactics. The (London) *Times* of Nov. 8, referring to the result of the Presidential election, says: "We cannot profess particularly to regret an event which may be regarded as the appropriate penalty for a discreditable subservience to the meanest influences in American politics and a culpable neglect of the decencies of international intercourse." This betrays ignorance of the real facts of the case, and of the temper of the American people. Mr. Cleveland's action with regard to Lord Sackville would win him votes rather than forfeit them. The victory has been won by those who were most subservient to the "meanest influences of American politics." The *Pall Mall Gazette* of November 10, referring to the Premier's remark at the Guildhall, already quoted, speaks of it as "a covert exultant reference to the defeat of President Cleveland;" and it declares that the remark was "unworthy of an Englishman, savouring as it does of gloating over a man when he is down. That is never very lovely, and when you have helped, unintentionally, to trip him up, it is still more objectionable." But in what way did Lord Salisbury help to trip Mr. Cleveland up? In no way at all, as far as my knowledge goes. President Cleveland, so far as his action towards Lord Sackville is concerned, is utterly undeserving of a shred of English sympathy..

The question now is—What is to be done? My own mind is clear on the point. If Lord Sackville is driven from Washington no successor should be appointed; our embassy should be withdrawn; and all diplomatic intercourse with the United States suspended until the politicians of that country, at all events those of them who hold Cabinet office, learn how to behave themselves like gentlemen. This would not lead to war, and it would be an impressive rebuke, administered before the eyes of the whole world, of that insufferable arrogance which is rapidly rendering the Americans odious in the eyes of other nations. No greater service could be done to the Americans themselves than to give them this much-needed lesson in humility; and though the present generation of Americans would curse us for doing it, a future generation would rise up to call us blessed. England has rendered many signal services to the great Republic of the

West. From her the Americans have inherited those robust qualities which have contributed more than anything else to make them great. If now the mother-country can impart to her somewhat imperious and ungrateful child those higher qualities which adorn and ennoble character, and which she herself, in spite of her rugged exterior, exemplifies in so eminent a degree, she will have rendered the most signal service of all, for she will have bestowed upon her offspring the crown of beauty which at once softens and perfects strength.

GEORGE BROOKS.

